DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 850 SP 029 268

AUTHOR	Duck, Greg; Cunningham, Debra
TITLE	School Experience in Queensland Pre-Service Teacher Education Programs. 1. Research Report.
INSTITUTION	Queensland Board of Teacher Education, Toowong (Australia).
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-7242-1344-9
PUB DATE	Jun 84
NOTE	118p.; For the conference report, see SP 029 269.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; *Field Experience Programs; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Student Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS	*Australia (Queensland)

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of the first two stages of the Queensland Board of Teacher Education's investigation of school experience in preservice teacher education programs in Queensland, Australia. Part I reports on the first phase of the study involving a survey of student teachers, supervising teachers, school coordinators of practice teaching, and teacher education lecturers. Sections address: background information on survey subjects; types of school experiences; activities undertaken in school experiences; school experience settings; roles of supervising teachers, lecturers, and school coordinators; relationship between college or university studies and school experience; provision of information to supervising teachers; assessment of student teachers; participation by school personnel and lecturers in activities designed to plan and coordinate school experience; other aspects of school experiences; and desirable changes to school experiences to make them more meaningful in teacher preparation. Part II reports on the second stage of the study involving a number of seminars throughout Queensland at which the survey results for individual programs were discussed. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED285850

SCHOOL EXPERIENCE IN QUEENSLAND PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N.H Fry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1. Research Report

SP 029 468

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP

SCHOOL EXPERIENCE IN QUEENSLAND PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

1. Research Report

Board of Teacher Education, Queensland
P.O. Box 389, Toowong, Q. 4066.

June 1984

The material included in this report is not subject to copyright and no restrictions apply to the use or reproduction of any part of it, provided that the source is acknowledged.

National Library of Australia card number and ISBN

ISBN 0 7242 1344 9

PREFACE

This report presents the results of the first two major stages of the Board of Teacher Education's investigation of school experience in pre-service teacher education programs in Queensland. The first phase of the study, reported in Part 1, involved a survey of student teachers, supervising teachers, school co-ordinators of practice teaching and teacher education lecturers. The second stage, reported in Part 2 of this report, involved a number of seminars throughout Queensland at which the survey results for individual programs were discussed. The third stage of the project is a statewide conference on school experience to be held in September 1984. It is planned to publish a report of the conference separately.

This report was prepared by Greg Duck and Debra Cunningham. Maureen Bella was involved in the questionnaire design phase of the project. The study was carried out under the aegis of the Board's Research Committee, the membership of which is shown in the appendix.

The contribution of the following is gratefully acknowledged:

- questionnaire respondents, who provided the information on which Part 1 of this report is based
- school experience co-ordinators and others in the tertiary institutions, who provided information to allow samples to be drawn, who organised the seminars to discuss the results for programs with which they were associated and who were generally supportive of the project throughout
- seminar participants whose deliberations provided the basis for Part 2 of this report
- Jackie Sorensen who typed the report and the questionnaires, and entered the questionnaire data onto computer files.

CONTENTS

	Page
PART 1: Survey of Student Teachers, Supervising Teachers, School Co-ordinators and Teacher Education Lecturers	
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODOLOGY	3
RESULTS	9
1.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION	9
1.1 Student teachers	9
1.2 Supervising teachers	10
1.3 School co-ordinators	12
1.4 Lecturers	13
2.0 TYPES OF SCHOOL EXPERIENCE	14
2.1 Time allocated to different types of school experience	16
2.2 Advantages of regular contact	17
2.3 Disadvantages of regular contact	20
3.0 ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN IN SCHOOL EXPERIENCE	21
3.1 Time spent on various activities	21
3.2 Desired changes to time allocated	25
3.3 Importance of the activities	26
4.0 SETTINGS IN WHICH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE UNDERTAKEN	28
5.0 ROLES OF SUPERVISING TEACHERS, LECTURERS AND SCHOOL CO-ORDINATORS	30
5.1 Role of supervising teachers	30
5.2 Role of lecturers	36
5.3 Role of school co-ordinators	42
6.0 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY STUDIES and SCHOOL EXPERIENCE	44
6.1 Student teacher responses	44
6.2 Supervising teacher responses	48
6.3 Lecturer responses	50
7.0 PARTICIPATION BY SCHOOL PERSONNEL AND LECTURERS IN ACTIVITIES DESIGNED TO PLAN AND CO-ORDINATE SCHOOL EXPERIENCE	53
7.1 Participation by supervising teachers	54
7.2 Participation by school co-ordinators	55
7.3 Participation by lecturers	56
8.0 PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO SUPERVISING TEACHERS	57
8.1 Information about the school experience program	57
8.2 Information about individual student teachers	59
9.0 ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS	63
9.1 Who makes the assessment	63
9.2 Role of school co-ordinator in assessment	64
9.3 Provision of feedback on assessment	64
9.4 Comparability of rating standards among lecturers and among supervising teachers	67
9.5 Moderation of grades	68
9.6 Discussion of assessment criteria with student teachers prior to evaluation	69
9.7 The assessment criteria	71

	Page
10.0 OTHER ASPECTS OF SCHOOL EXPERIENCE	74
10.1 Best aspects of school experience	74
10.2 Allocation of student teachers to supervising teachers	79
10.3 Reasons for teachers becoming supervising teachers	83
10.4 Time in the year when block practice scheduled	83
10.5 Use of schools' resources by student teachers	86
10.6 The industrial agreement governing practice teaching in state schools	86
10.7 Areas in which school personnel would like more assistance	88
11.0 DESIRABLE CHANGES TO SCHOOL EXPERIENCE TO MAKE IT A MORE MEANINGFUL PREPARATION FOR TEACHING	90
11.1 Student teacher responses	90
11.2 Supervising teacher responses	91
11.3 School co-ordinator responses	92
11.4 Lecturer responses	92
SUMMARY	94
REFERENCES	98
PART 2: Report of School Experience Seminars	
REPORT OF SCHOOL EXPERIENCE SEMINARS	101
Timing and duration of school experience	101
Variety of activities undertaken in school experience	102
Settings in which school experience undertaken	102
Role of lecturers in school experience	102
Selection and preparation of supervising teachers	103
Participation of teachers in planning activities	104
Provision of information to supervising teachers about individual student teachers	105
Communication and interaction	105
Relationship between school experience and tertiary studies	106
Assessment of student teachers' school experience	106
Diagnostic feedback	106
APPENDIX: Membership of Research Committee of Board of Teacher Education	108

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1:	Timing of major activities of school experience project	3
Table 2:	Sample and response rates for each program	6
Table 3:	Sex of student teachers	9
Table 4:	Age of student teachers	9
Table 5:	Sex of supervising teachers	10
Table 6:	Teaching experience of supervising teachers	10
Table 7:	Supervising teacher experience of supervising teachers	10
Table 8:	Years of tertiary study by supervising teachers	10
Table 9:	Year levels taught by supervising teachers in 1982	11
Table 10:	Size of schools in which supervising teachers taught	11
Table 11:	Sex of school co-ordinators	12
Table 12:	Position of school co-ordinators in the school	12
Table 13:	Teaching experience of school co-ordinators	12
Table 14:	Supervising teacher experience of school co-ordinators	12
Table 15:	Size of schools in which school co-ordinators located	13
Table 16:	Sex of lecturers	13
Table 17:	School teaching experience of lecturers	13
Table 18:	Supervising teacher experience of lecturers	13
Table 19:	Teaching areas of lecturers	14
Table 20:	Time allocated to block practice school experience during final year in 1982	15
Table 21:	Opinions concerning proportion of time devoted to block practice and regular contact	16
Table 22:	Time spent by students per day on activities of school experience during final year	22
Table 23:	Time per day spent by student teachers outside of school hours on certain activities during block practice	23
Table 24:	Average time spent per day in each activity and proportion of students indicating "too little" time spent on activities	25
Table 25:	Opinions concerning importance of activities in final-year school experience	27
Table 26:	Proportion of student teachers with teaching experience in a number of settings, and student teacher opinion concerning importance of having experience in each setting	29
Table 27:	Mean student teacher ratings of the actual and ideal occurrence of supervising teacher activities	31
Table 28:	Mean supervising teacher ratings of the actual and ideal occurrence of supervising teacher activities	34
Table 29:	Mean student teacher ratings of the actual and ideal frequency of activities of lecturers	37
Table 30:	Mean lecturer ratings of the actual and ideal frequency of activities of lecturers	40
Table 31:	Mean school co-ordinator ratings of the actual and ideal frequency of activities of school co-ordinators	43
Table 32:	Student teacher opinion of the extent of focus on school experience in campus lectures	45
Table 33:	Student teacher opinion of the extent of relationship between school experience and four areas of campus study, and opinion as to whether a closer relationship should exist	45

		Page
Table 34:	Student teacher opinion of the frequency of differences in expectations between lecturers and supervising teachers	47
Table 35:	Supervising teacher opinion of the extent to which it was evident that student teachers used their college/university learning during school experience	49
Table 36:	Lecturer opinion of the extent of focus on school experience in campus lectures	50
Table 37:	Supervising teachers' actual and desired participation in various activities	54
Table 38:	School co-ordinators' actual and desired participation in various activities	55
Table 39:	College/university lecturers' actual and desired participation in various activities	56
Table 40:	School personnel responses concerning sources of useful information about the school experience program	57
Table 41:	Supervising teacher responses concerning information provided to supervising teachers about individual student teachers	60
Table 42:	University/college lecturer responses concerning information provided to supervising teachers about individual student teachers	62
Table 43:	Opinions concerning who was involved in making the assessment	63
Table 44:	Student teacher responses concerning types of feedback received on their performance	65
Table 45:	Supervising teacher responses concerning ways in which they provided student teachers with feedback on their performance	66
Table 46:	Lecturer responses concerning types of feedback provided to student teachers	66
Table 47:	Supervising teacher opinion concerning the importance of payment for supervising student teachers	87
Table 48:	Supervising teacher opinion concerning the most attractive incentive to supervising student teachers	88

PART 1

Survey of Student Teachers,

Supervising Teachers, School Co-ordinators

and Teacher Education Lecturers

INTRODUCTION

Practice teaching, school experience, field studies, the practicum and student teaching are just some of the terms which are used to describe those activities which student teachers undertake in schools as part of their pre-service teacher education program.

For this study, the term school experience was adopted in order that a wider concept than practice teaching, i.e. teaching a class of pupils, would be involved. School experience was defined to mean all of the activities in which student teachers were involved in schools during their formal preparation. While gaining experience in teaching a class of pupils under the immediate supervision of an experienced classroom teacher is a major component of school experience, it is not the only activity making up a student's experience in a school. For instance, in some programs, students undertake detailed studies of individual children, classes or schools as part of their school experience.

There can be little doubt about the significant influence which the practicum has on a pre-service student teacher's professional preparation for teaching. Evidence from overseas (e.g. Conant, 1963) has shown the great importance of school experience in the development of teachers. Indeed, Conant declared that student teaching is "the one indisputably essential element in professional education" (p.142). More recently, Zeichner's (1980) review cited numerous studies in which those involved in the practicum attested to its significance in the development of student teachers. Turney, Cairns, Eltis, Hatton, Thew, Towler and Wright (1982) commented on a number of Australian and overseas studies which reported on the influential nature of school experience.

In Australia, the importance of school experience has been reflected in recent years in the number of research studies investigating school experience and the number of conferences at which school experience has been the central theme. National conferences on school experience have been held at Perth (Mount Lawley CAE, 1975) and Armidale (Newman and Arkins, 1980). The Educational Research and Development Committee convened a national research seminar on teacher education at which many papers on school experience were presented (Hewitson, 1979). In addition, there have been Queensland State conferences on the practicum at Mount Gravatt (Price, 1978) and Townsville (Marland, 1981). The most recent national research and review investigation of school experience is the Supervision Development Project undertaken by Turney and his colleagues (1982). As well as these national and statewide efforts, individual tertiary institutions are continually researching and reviewing their school experience programs.

The importance of school experience has been recognised in the recent State and national reports on teacher education. Issues pertaining to school experience were given considerable attention in these reports. The National Inquiry into Teacher Education (1980) recommended that:

> *Each period of practical experience should be planned as part of an ordered and sequential teaching practice program culminating in the student experiencing the full range of duties and tasks allotted to beginning teachers.*

The 1978 Review of Teacher Education in Queensland recommended that *practice teaching should occupy a central position in the diploma course and all professional studies should be functionally related to it.*

While there has been considerable research and discussion on school experience in recent times, the evidence indicates that this feature of pre-service programs continues to be a cause for concern among student teachers, tertiary staff and supervising teachers. In the United States, Zeichner (1980) concluded that there are many unresolved issues in school experience and that more research focusing on the quality of field-based experiences is needed. On the other side of the Atlantic, Boothroyd (1979), for instance, found that there was a need for improved communication between

university staff, student teachers and supervising teachers in order that the quality of supervision could be improved. The review by Turney et al. (1982) of Australian and overseas studies on school experience found several problems with field-based studies. These included the gap between theory and practice, problems with the evaluation of student teaching, poor communication between tertiary institutions and schools, placement difficulties and the lack of a practicum curriculum. In their study, Campbell, Evans, Philp and Levis (1979) found that most student teachers did not know what college lecturers or supervising teachers expected of them during teaching practice and that there was little contact between student teachers and college staff with a view to helping students overcome difficulties associated with their classroom teaching practice.

Programs of practice teaching in Queensland were systematically reviewed in 1975-76 and reported on by Skilton (1979). This review showed that there were several problems with teaching practice arrangements including lack of communication between teacher education institutions and schools, lack of opportunity for supervising teachers to participate in policy formation, the conflicting expectations of supervising teachers and college staff, the disruption caused to the classes of the supervising teachers, and the lack of emphasis placed on the counselling of students following their teaching practice sessions.

Previous research studies undertaken by the Queensland Board of Teacher Education have suggested that beginning teachers and lecturers believe that school experience needs to be improved. In the Board's study on the preparation of teachers to teach reading (Teacher Education Review Committee, 1979), over two-thirds of beginning teachers reported that "too little" time was spent at practising schools. College lecturers reported that the co-ordination between lectures and normal teaching practice was minimal. There were indications from the Board's project on the induction of beginning teachers (Teacher Education Review Committee, 1981) that school experience was causing problems. At the conference held to discuss the results of the induction project, beginning teachers complained that school experience lacked practical relevance for future teaching.

As all Diploma of Teaching (Primary) programs in Queensland were reviewed for re-accreditation purposes since the last statewide investigation of school experience was undertaken (Skilton, 1979), it was considered timely to initiate a new study of school experience in pre-service teacher preparation programs in Queensland.

The project was seen to have two broad purposes. Firstly, it would provide information on individual programs which could be taken up by those involved in the programs. To this end, a separate report was written on each of the fourteen primary and secondary school experience programs operating in Queensland, and from these reports and subsequent seminars, recommendations on individual programs arose. Secondly, it was envisaged that generalisations and suggestions for improvement in the State as a whole would emerge from the investigation.

METHODOLOGY

The school experience project was divided into three stages. Firstly, a survey of student teachers, supervising teachers, school co-ordinators of school experience and teacher education lecturers was undertaken. The results of the survey were written up in individual reports on the fourteen school experience programs in Queensland, as well as in this consolidated report. The second stage involved a discussion of the reports of individual school experience programs at a series of seminars in which school personnel, lecturers and student teachers participated. The third stage is a statewide conference on school experience in which those involved in the various programs will participate.

Within each stage of the project there were a number of major activities. The timing of each of these major activities is shown below in Table 1.

Table 1: Timing of major activities of school experience project

Dates	Activities
Stage 1:	
October - November 1981	Preliminary interviews with student teachers, tertiary staff and school personnel
January - June 1982	Development and trialling of questionnaires
July - December 1982	Administration of questionnaires
September - October 1982	Interviews with teachers who would prefer not to supervise student teachers
September 1982 - June 1983	Analysis of questionnaires
Stage 2:	
April - November 1983	Writing of reports on individual programs
October - December 1983	Seminars to discuss individual programs
January - February 1984	Preparation of summaries of individual seminars and overall seminar summary
March - May 1984	Writing consolidated report on results of survey
Stage 3:	
April - August 1984	Organisation of conference
September 1984	Conference
September - December 1984	Preparation of conference proceedings and other material for publication

Development of the questionnaire

The school experience project commenced, as is indicated above, towards the end of 1981. At that time, preliminary interviews were held with some college co-ordinators of teaching practice and other college lecturers, supervising teachers and student teachers. These people were involved with school experience programs in three tertiary institutions in South-East Queensland. In all, discussions were held with fifty to sixty people in group interview situations. The groups were homogeneous so that, for example, student teachers were interviewed together without supervising teachers or college lecturers being present. The purpose of these interviews was to discuss the practicum experiences of students, teachers and lecturers and to identify an initial list

of issues which would be investigated in the study. The interviews were unstructured and open-ended and interviewees were encouraged to suggest areas in school experience which they considered required investigation.

These preliminary discussions gave rise to many issues to be investigated in the study. Other issues for investigation were drawn from the literature on school experience, in particular, the previous Queensland review of practice teaching (Skilton, 1979). A third source of issues was the Research Committee of the Board of Teacher Education.

From these issues, sets of questions to be asked of respondents in the project were developed. Four sets of questions were developed: for supervising teachers, student teachers, tertiary lecturers and school co-ordinators of teaching practice. Originally, it was intended to use the questions on interview schedules. It was later decided, however, that the sets of questions were sufficiently detailed and covered a sufficiently broad area to allow them to be used on mailed questionnaires. The questions were therefore adapted for use as questionnaire items.

The draft questionnaires were discussed with the college co-ordinators of teaching practice at most of the tertiary institutions in Brisbane. Following modifications, the questionnaires were trialled with a small sample of each group of respondents. Adjustments were made in the light of these trials and the questionnaires were in final form by June 1982.

The questionnaires sought information in the following areas:

- background information on the respondents
- types of school experience undertaken
- activities undertaken as part of school experience
- role of supervising teachers, co-ordinators and college and university staff during school experience
- relationship between tertiary studies and school experience
- participation by school and tertiary personnel in activities designed to plan and co-ordinate school experience
- provision of information to supervising teachers
- assessment of student teachers
- the industrial agreement concerning practice teaching
- selection of supervising teachers and allocation of students to supervising teachers
- desirable changes to school experience to make it a more meaningful preparation for teaching
- a number of miscellaneous issues.

The questionnaires were very detailed, and there was a large number of open-ended questions. As can be gathered from the account of their development, the questionnaires were not based on any model of supervision or good supervision. Rather the intention was to gather information on issues which were seen as important by those most closely involved with school experience and by previous reviews of school experience. It was hoped that the information obtained would be useful in developing solutions to problems which were seen to exist.

The same set of questionnaires was used for all programs in Queensland. This had the potential disadvantage of not always allowing the special features of particular programs to emerge from the results or to be taken into account in the wording of some questions. This potential problem was minimised by the use of a large number of open-ended questions. The advantage of using a standard format was that it allowed comparisons among programs to be more readily made and enabled resources to be used more effectively.

Sample selection and response rates

It was decided to select student teachers from the population of final-year students since their responses would be informed by their experience of the entire program.

Names of final-year student teachers in each of the fourteen primary and secondary pre-service teacher education programs were obtained from the tertiary institutions. The programs varied widely in size of enrolment, the two smallest programs having twenty-one final-year student teachers enrolled while the largest had 288 final-year student teachers enrolled in 1982. A stratified random sample of students, using the same sampling ratio for each program, would have meant that very few students were selected for some programs while a large number was selected for others. As one aim of the study was to provide information about individual programs, it was considered unacceptable to have some programs represented by very few respondents. A different sampling ratio was therefore used for each program. The sampling ratio was designed so that at least forty or so student teachers would be selected from each program, where this was possible.

Table 2: Sample and response rates for each program

	STUDENT TEACHERS					SUPERVISING TEACHERS			SCHOOL CO-ORDINATORS			LECTURERS		
	No. final-year students	Sampling ratio	Sample (N)	Achieved sample (N)	Response rate (%)	Sample (N)	Achieved sample (N)	Response rate (%)	Sample (N)	Achieved sample (N)	Response rate (%)	Sample (N)	Achieved sample (N)	Response rate (%)
Primary programs														
Mount Gravatt Campus, BCAE Diploma of Teaching	73	1 in 2	37	27	73	37	30	81	26	23	88	19	15	79
Kelvin Grove Campus, BCAE Diploma of Teaching	66	2 in 3	44	27	61	44	36	82	25	25	100	14	11	79
Carseldine Campus, BCAE Diploma of Teaching	81	1 in 2	40	36	90	40	31	78	15	14	93	22	19	86
Carseldine Campus, BCAE Graduate Diploma in Teaching	28	All	28	17	61	28	16	57	-	-	-	9	8	89
McAuley College Diploma of Teaching	74	1 in 2	37	32	86	37	31	84	23	17	74	16	13	81
Darling Downs IAE Diploma of Teaching	73	1 in 2	36	33	92	36	27	75	10	10	100	3	3	100
Capricornia IAE Diploma of Teaching	45	All	45	35	78	45	34	76	15	14	93	10	9	90
James Cook University of NQ Diploma of Teaching	87	1 in 2	44	33	75	44	35	80	29	26	90	28	24	86
TOTAL PRIMARY	527	-	311	240	77	311	240	77	143	129	90	121	102	84
Secondary programs														
Mount Gravatt Campus, BCAE Diploma of Teaching	54	All	54	41	76	54	39	72	26	23	88	17	14	82
Mount Gravatt Campus, BCAE Graduate Diploma in Teaching (joint program with Griffith Uni.)	21	All	21	14	67	21	15	71	-	-	-	8	7	88
Kelvin Grove Campus, BCAE Diploma of Teaching	288	1 in 3	96	76	79	96	71	74	63	50	79	38	30	79
Kelvin Grove Campus, BCAE Graduate Diploma in Teaching	76	1 in 2	38	23	61	38	22	58	-	-	-	17	12	71
University of Queensland Diploma in Education	214	1 in 5	43	33	77	43	30	70	27	21	78	16	14	88
James Cook University Bachelor of Education	21	All	21	16	76	19	16	84	6	5	83	6	5	83
TOTAL SECONDARY	674	-	273	203	74	271	193	71	122	99	81	102	82	80
TOTAL	1201	-	584	443	76	582	433	74	265	228	86	223	190	85

Using the sampling ratios shown in Table 2, samples of final-year student teachers were drawn for each of the fourteen primary and secondary pre-service teacher education programs in Queensland. A questionnaire, covering letter and reply-paid envelope were sent to each student teacher selected in the sample. In some cases, questionnaires were forwarded to the student teachers at their practising schools, while in other cases a private address was used. In all, 311 primary teacher education students and 273 secondary teacher education students were selected. After follow-up letters, 240 questionnaires from primary student teachers and 203 from secondary student teachers had been returned. The overall response rate for student teachers was 76 per cent. The rate varied among programs from 61 per cent to 92 per cent.

The teachers who supervised each student teacher selected in the sample were chosen in the supervising teacher sample. Questionnaires for supervising teachers were, in most cases, forwarded through the school principal. Secondary school principals were asked to distribute the questionnaires to the supervising teacher who spent the most time with the named student teacher. After follow-up letters, a total of 433 supervising teacher questionnaires were returned. These comprised 240 from supervising teachers in primary schools and 193 in secondary schools and represented an overall response rate of 74 per cent. The response rate varied from 57 per cent to 84 per cent.

School co-ordinators of the schools at which the student teachers undertook their school experience were selected in the co-ordinator sample. Again, questionnaires were forwarded via the principal. In the case of the one primary and two secondary Graduate Diploma programs, co-ordinators were not asked to complete questionnaires. This was because of the overlap of schools with other programs which may have meant school co-ordinators received several questionnaires. Similarly, not all co-ordinators involved with the other secondary programs received questionnaires because of the overlap of schools among these programs. Some co-ordinators, nonetheless, received a maximum of two questionnaires. Of the 265 school co-ordinators chosen in the sample, 228 returned their questionnaires, representing a response rate of 86 per cent. The response rates for individual programs varied from 74 per cent to 100 per cent.

The lecturers who supervised the sampled student teachers were included in the lecturer sample. In some cases, lecturers were involved in supervising student teachers in more than one program. These lecturers were assigned to one particular program, and asked to respond to the questionnaire in terms of their experiences supervising student teachers in the nominated program. For questionnaires to all groups of respondents, the nominated program was stamped on the front of the questionnaire. Questionnaires, covering letters and reply-paid envelopes were mailed to lecturers at the address of their tertiary institution. The lecturers' response rate varied from 71 per cent to 100 per cent. Overall, 190 lecturers, or 85 per cent of the sample, forwarded completed questionnaires to the Board.

Interviews with non-supervising teachers

Early in the project it became clear that an issue of some importance was the unwillingness of some teachers to undertake supervisory tasks. It was therefore decided to conduct interviews with a small sample of teachers who would prefer not to supervise student teachers. The interviews, with about twenty teachers in four groups, included teachers who had never supervised, teachers who had not supervised for some time, and teachers who were currently supervisors but wished not to be.

Reporting of results

The results to the questionnaire items are reported in the following sections of the report. In addition, some comments from the seminars held to discuss the programs have been included where appropriate. A summary of the interviews with teachers who would prefer not to supervise is also reported.

Answers to objective-answer questions are reported in two-part tables. The left-hand side of each table shows the overall results for primary programs, while the right-hand side gives the corresponding results for secondary programs.

Where possible, the number and proportion of responses to each alternative in each question have been reported. However, some questions were very detailed and, in the interests of space and ease of interpretation, it has been necessary in these cases to limit the reporting of results to mean scores. When proportions indicating a particular

response are shown in a table, the percentage is based on the number of respondents to the particular question rather than the total number of respondents to the questionnaire as a whole. The non-response rate to particular questions was very low and reporting results in this way does not alter interpretation.

Any differences between various groups of respondents are discussed only if, firstly, they meet statistical criteria (i.e. a difference must be of at least two standard errors), and secondly, they are judged to be educationally meaningful. In practice, with the sample sizes achieved there were many differences which were significant in a statistical sense but which in absolute terms were relatively small. Thus, differences commented on are generally highly significant statistically.

The responses on which the figures reported in the tables are based have not been statistically weighted. Two weighting schemes were tested: one in which equal weight was given to each program, and a second in which equal weight was given to each student enrolled. There were difficulties in this latter weighting scheme in determining the relative weight to give to each lecturer and school co-ordinator because of the differing ratio of lecturers and co-ordinators to students among the programs. Weighting of responses, however, affected the overall results only very slightly. The conclusions to be drawn were the same regardless of the weighting scheme used. In the interests of simplicity, then, it was decided to report the unweighted results.

RESULTS

1.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Each of the four groups of respondents was asked to answer questions giving certain background information. This information, shown in Tables 3 to 19, is commented on briefly in the following sections. As with all tables, results for primary and secondary programs are reported separately.

1.1 Student teachers

Table 3: Sex of student teachers

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=240)		SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=203)	
	N	%	N	%
Male	36	15	73	36
Female	204	85	129	64

Table 4: Age of student teachers

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS		SECONDARY PROGRAMS	
	N	%	N	%
Under 21	167	70	94	48
21-24	43	18	74	37
Over 24	30	12	30	15

For the primary programs, the vast majority (85 per cent) of final-year student teachers were female. In none of the primary programs was the proportion of male students more than 30 per cent, and for two programs, less than 10 per cent of respondents were male.

There was a more even balance between the sexes in the secondary programs, although still nearly two-thirds of the students were female.

Most of the students in the primary programs were aged under 21 years, with some 12 per cent aged over 24 years. The secondary student teachers were, on average, older than their primary counterparts; nearly equal proportions of final-year secondary student teachers being aged under 21 and aged 21 years or more. This result was expected as a large proportion of the secondary teachers were in at least their fourth year of tertiary education, while all but a handful of the primary teacher education students were in the final year of a three-year program.

1.2 Supervising teachers

Table 5: Sex of supervising teachers

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=240)		SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=193)	
	N	%	N	%
Male	92	39	95	49
Female	147	61	98	51

Table 6: Teaching experience of supervising teachers

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS		SECONDARY PROGRAMS	
	N	%	N	%
Less than 1 year	1	*	1	1
1-3 years	13	6	11	6
4-10 years	94	39	78	41
More than 10 years	130	55	102	53

* Less than 1 per cent

Table 7: Supervising teacher experience of supervising teachers

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS		SECONDARY PROGRAMS	
	N	%	N	%
Less than 1 year	45	19	23	12
1-3 years	58	24	40	21
4-10 years	96	40	103	53
More than 10 years	40	17	27	14

Table 8: Years of tertiary study by supervising teachers

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS		SECONDARY PROGRAMS	
	N	%	N	%
1 year	25	11	11	6
2 years	31	13	13	7
3 years	95	41	30	16
4 years	57	24	71	37
More than 4 years	25	11	65	34

Table 9: Year levels taught by supervising teachers in 1982

	N	%
Primary		
Year 1 only	24	10
Year 2 only	18	8
Year 3 only	15	6
Year 4 only	16	7
Year 5 only	29	12
Year 6 only	38	16
Year 7 only	43	18
Mixed year levels	56	23
Secondary		
Year 8	126	65
Year 9	143	74
Year 10	162	84
Year 11	140	72
Year 12	132	68

Table 10: Size of schools in which supervising teachers taught

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS		SECONDARY PROGRAMS	
	N	%	N	%
Fewer than 35 pupils	12	5	-	-
36-100 pupils	17	7	-	-
101-300 pupils	43	18	2	1
301-600 pupils	74	32	36	19
More than 600 pupils	88	38	155	81

A majority (61 per cent) of the primary school supervising teachers were female. A large proportion (94 per cent) had at least four years' teaching experience and a majority had at least four years' experience as supervising teachers. Three-quarters of the primary supervising teachers had three or more years of tertiary education. The supervising teachers taught across the range of primary school year levels, with a slightly higher proportion of teachers teaching in the upper year levels of the primary school. The bias towards the upper year levels was influenced by one college's policy of allocating third-year student teachers to the upper primary school and second-year students to the lower primary school. Twenty-three per cent of supervising teachers were teaching more than one year level. In one college, policy was that students should undertake their first-semester block practice in a multi-grade teaching situation. Half of the teachers involved in that institution's program therefore taught mixed year levels (the other half being the second-semester supervising teachers). In another program, 42 per cent of the supervising teachers taught more than one year level. The primary supervising teachers were teaching mainly in the larger schools of more than 300 pupils, although 50 per cent or more of the teachers in the two programs which also had a high proportion of teachers in multi-grade situations taught in schools of 300 or fewer pupils.

The secondary supervising teachers overall were equally divided between the sexes, although the percentage of male teachers was as low as 23 per cent for one program and as high as 77 per cent for another. The secondary supervising teachers were experienced teachers, with greater than half having more than ten years' teaching experience; two-thirds had at least four years' experience as supervising teachers. A majority (71 per cent) of the secondary supervising teachers had at least four years of tertiary education. The supervising teachers taught a range of year levels, but in the two university programs, 50 per cent or less of the supervising teachers taught Year 8. A big majority (81 per cent) of supervising teachers taught in the larger schools of more than 600 pupils.

1.3 School co-ordinators

Table 11: Sex of school co-ordinators

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=129)		SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=99)	
	N	%	N	%
Male	100	78	73	75
Female	29	22	25	26

Table 12: Position of school co-ordinators in the school

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS		SECONDARY PROGRAMS	
	N	%	N	%
Principal	95	75	15	15
Deputy Principal	21	17	62	63
Teacher	6	5	7	7
Other	5	4	14	14

Table 13: Teaching experience of school co-ordinators

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS		SECONDARY PROGRAMS	
	N	%	N	%
4-10 years	10	8	3	3
More than 10 years	118	92	96	97

Table 14: Supervising teacher experience of school co-ordinators

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS		SECONDARY PROGRAMS	
	N	%	N	%
Less than 1 year	20	16	6	6
1-3 years	27	21	18	19
4-10 years	57	45	43	45
More than 10 years	22	18	29	30

Table 15: Size of schools in which school co-ordinators located

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS		SECONDARY PROGRAMS	
	N	%	N	%
100 pupils or fewer	29	12	1	1
101-300 pupils	43	18	1	1
301-600 pupils	74	32	21	21
More than 600 pupils	88	38	76	77

More than three-quarters of the primary school co-ordinators were male and three-quarters were school principals. Most (92 per cent) had more than ten years' teaching experience and a majority (63 per cent) had at least four years' experience as supervising teachers, although 16 per cent had less than one year's supervising teacher experience. Most of the co-ordinators were in schools of more than 300 pupils.

Three-quarters of the secondary school co-ordinators were also male, but unlike their primary school counterparts, a majority were deputy principals. All but three co-ordinators had more than ten years' teaching experience, and 75 per cent had more than three years' experience as supervising teachers. Most were in large schools of more than 600 pupils.

1.4 Lecturers

Table 16: Sex of lecturers

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=102)		SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=82)	
	N	%	N	%
Male	82	80	67	82
Female	20	20	15	18

Table 17: School teaching experience of lecturers

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS		SECONDARY PROGRAMS	
	N	%	N	%
Less than 1 year	-	-	4	5
1-3 years	7	7	4	5
4-10 years	41	40	40	49
More than 10 years	54	53	33	41

Table 18: Supervising teacher experience of lecturers

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS		SECONDARY PROGRAMS	
	N	%	N	%
Less than 1 year	40	41	22	27
1-3 years	24	25	19	23
4-10 years	23	24	37	45
More than 10 years	10	10	4	5

Table 19: Teaching areas* of lecturers

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS		SECONDARY PROGRAMS	
	N	%	N	%
Curriculum Studies	66	65	74	90
Foundation Studies	34	33	12	15
Liberal Studies	20	20	8	10

* Some staff were teaching in more than one area.

Most of the college and university staff members were male. Ninety per cent or more of the tertiary institution staff had at least four years' teaching experience in a school; only four lecturers involved in secondary programs had less than one year of teaching experience in a school. A larger proportion of primary program lecturers (42 per cent) than secondary program lecturers (27 per cent) had less than one year's experience as supervising teachers. Most lecturers taught in the curriculum studies area, while a substantial proportion of lecturers involved with primary programs also taught foundation studies or liberal studies.

2.0 TYPES OF SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

All of the programs included at least four weeks of block practice in the final year. In addition, three of the programs also had formal provision for contact with a school on a regular basis as part of the school experience program for final-year student teachers. In some other courses, programs of regular contact with a school were incorporated into school experience in earlier years.

The amount of time allocated to final-year school experience in the fourteen programs investigated is given below in Table 20.

Table 20: Time allocated to block practice school experience during final year in 1982

	Time allocated for block practice (in weeks)		
	Semester 1	Semester 2	Total
PRIMARY			
Diploma of Teaching			
Mount Gravatt	3	3	6
Kelvin Grove	-	6	6
Carseldine*	3	3	6
McAuley	4	4	8
Darling Downs**	3 + 1	-	4
Capricornia	4	4	8
James Cook University	3	3	6
Graduate Diploma in Teaching			
Carseldine*	4	4	8
SECONDARY			
Diploma of Teaching			
Mount Gravatt	3	3	6
Kelvin Grove	-	6	6
Graduate Diploma in Teaching			
Mount Gravatt	3 + 1	3 + 2	9
Kelvin Grove	2	5 + 3	10
Diploma in Education			
University of Queensland	2 + 1 + 3	4	10
Bachelor of Education			
James Cook University	4	4	8

* Both Carseldine programs included thirteen days of one day per week contact in both first and second semesters in addition to the block practice.

** The Darling Downs program included five half-day per week visits in second semester in addition to the block practice.

All of the primary programs incorporated one or two block practice sessions of at least three weeks' duration during final year, and all but the Kelvin Grove program had two discrete blocks during final year. The total time allocated to block practice during final year in the primary programs was generally either six or eight weeks, although the total time devoted to block practice in the third year of the Diploma of Teaching undertaken at Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education was four weeks. However, in 1982, Darling Downs also had five half-day visits to schools during second semester as part of the unit on Teaching Children with Special Needs. Student teachers in both of the Carseldine programs undertook a School Studies program which incorporated thirteen one day per week visits to schools in each semester.

The three- and four-year secondary programs included either six or eight weeks of block practice in final year. The Kelvin Grove school experience program for the three-year diploma consisted of one six-week block at the beginning of second semester, while the Mount Gravatt and James Cook programs had blocks in both first and second semesters. The one-year postgraduate courses had a total of nine or ten weeks' school experience.

2.1 Time allocated to different types of school experience

Student teachers, supervising teachers, school co-ordinators and college or university staff were asked to indicate whether they considered that the time devoted to block practice was far too little, too little, about right, too great or far too great. A similar question was asked concerning contact with schools on a regular basis. A relatively large number of questionnaire respondents did not answer with respect to regular contact. The responses are summarised in Table 21.

Table 21: Opinions concerning proportion of time devoted to block practice and regular contact

	Far too little		Too little		About right		Too great		Far too great	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
PRIMARY PROGRAMS										
Student teachers										
block (N=239)	10	4	72	30	148	62	7	3	2	1
regular (N=210)	45	21	65	31	82	39	15	7	3	1
Supervising teachers										
block (N=227)	10	4	70	31	136	60	10	4	1	*
regular (N=173)	48	28	72	42	52	30	-	-	1	1
Co-ordinators										
block (N=126)	10	8	27	21	84	67	5	4	-	-
regular (N=94)	24	26	41	44	28	30	-	-	1	1
Lecturers										
block (N=101)	3	3	21	21	76	75	1	1	-	-
regular (N=79)	13	16	28	35	36	46	2	3	-	-
SECONDARY PROGRAMS										
Student teachers										
block (N=203)	9	4	65	32	120	59	8	4	1	1
regular (N=115)	37	32	44	38	29	25	3	3	2	2
Supervising teachers										
block (N=189)	13	7	48	25	123	65	3	2	2	1
regular (N=100)	44	44	31	31	22	22	2	2	1	1
Co-ordinators										
block (N=98)	4	4	10	10	77	78	6	6	1	1
regular (N=50)	15	30	17	34	17	34	-	-	1	2
Lecturers										
block (N=79)	-	-	20	25	54	68	3	4	2	3
regular (N=51)	9	18	29	57	11	22	1	2	1	2

* Less than 1 per cent

For the primary programs, a majority of each group of respondents reported that the proportion of time devoted to block practice school experience was about right. Still, between a quarter and a third of each group considered that too little time was given to block practice. There was no systematic relationship between the proportion of respondents indicating that too little or far too little time was spent in block practice and whether the course with which respondents were involved contained six or eight weeks of block practice in the final year. In fact, the respondents who were most satisfied with the time allocated to block practice were involved with a program which included a total of six weeks of block teaching in third year. However, the students and supervising

teachers who were involved with the program having only four weeks of block teaching practice were the least satisfied. More than 50 per cent of these respondents considered that the total time given to block teaching should be increased.

Greater than half of those student teachers, supervising teachers, school co-ordinators and lecturers who responded to the question concerning the proportion of time devoted to contact with a school on a regular basis reported that there was too little or far too little time devoted to this form of school experience. It is of interest to note that a higher proportion of students and supervising teachers in the three-year programs which included twenty-six days of regular visits in the final year reported that they were satisfied with the time allocation to regular contact.

The pattern of results for the secondary programs was much the same as that for the primary programs. Again, a majority of each group of respondents considered the time allocated to block practice was about right. The proportion considering that not enough time was allocated to block practice varied from 14 per cent in the case of school co-ordinators to 36 per cent for student teachers. A majority of respondents in each group considered that too little time was given to contact with a school on a regular basis. Up to nearly one-half of each group, however, did not respond to the question concerning the proportion of time given to regular contact school experience. Even assuming that all non-respondents to this question were satisfied with the time given to regular contact, still one-third or more of the total respondents to the questionnaire considered that more time should be given to this type of school experience.

2.2 Advantages of regular contact

All four groups of respondents were asked to list what they considered to be the advantages of contact with a school on a regular basis. As noted earlier, only three of the eight primary programs had formal provision for students to have regular contact with a school in their final year, while none of the six secondary programs had such provision. The School Studies program of regular visits associated with both the Diploma and Graduate Diploma programs at Carseldine was designed to run concurrently with a college program in Curriculum and Education Studies. The continuous contact was designed to enable students to be involved in school experiences which were closely related to the design of the college course. During school studies, students were involved in a study of individual children, a range of primary classes and the school as a functioning entity. The program of regular contact school experience associated with the Diploma of Teaching at Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education was part of the unit on Teaching Children with Special Needs. It provided students with an opportunity to develop skills in teaching "special education" students, based on a theoretical study of exceptional children. Thus, the Carseldine and Darling Downs programs were different in their specific purposes.

Student teachers were asked to give advantages of regular contact only if they were involved with this type of school experience during their final year. Similarly, supervising teachers, school co-ordinators and tertiary lecturers were asked to respond only if, during 1982, they were involved in the supervision of students in contact with a school on a regular basis. Nonetheless, some respondents answered this question even though they were not so involved.

2.2.1 Student teacher responses

Of the 128 student teachers who listed advantages of contact with a school on a regular basis, sixty-five were enrolled in one of the two Carseldine programs or the Darling Downs program. Although the Carseldine and Darling Downs programs had different specific purposes, the most common advantage listed by student teachers of both institutions' programs was that regular contact allowed the student to observe and understand children's development over a long period of time. In all, twenty-two of the sixty-five students mentioned this as an

advantage of regular contact. Another advantage listed by several students from both types of program was that regular contact allowed students more time to prepare their lessons and to reflect on their teaching over the week. Eight students reported that regular contact gave them the opportunity to try innovative teaching strategies; several of the students in one of the programs said that they were confident to try new ideas without fear of failure because their teaching during regular contact was not assessed. Sixteen student teachers (fifteen of them were enrolled in one program) reported that regular contact with a school gave them greater opportunity to put theory into practice, making the theory more meaningful and relevant.

Sixty-three student teachers who were not involved in a formal program of regular contact school experience during their final year nevertheless commented on the advantages, or possible advantages, of contact with a school on a regular basis. Some of these students had been involved with one day a week visits in previous years of their course, some had arranged informal regular contacts with schools, while some commented from a hypothetical point of view. The most common advantage, mentioned by eighteen of the students, was that **regular contact would be a useful preparation for block teaching: it would give the students the opportunity to become familiar with the school and the teachers, and allow student teachers to develop a relationship with the pupils they would teach during block practice.** Eleven students reported that regular contact on a long-term basis would give them the opportunity to observe and monitor children's development over a longer period than was possible during block practice. The other advantages of regular contact reported by at least three students each were:

- students are considered more as members of staff, rather than students if they visit a school regularly
- regular contact provides a continual link between theory and practice
- it allows students to experience a greater variety of teaching situations
- there is more opportunity for experimentation.

2.2.2 Supervising teacher responses

Twenty-three teachers involved in supervising student teachers in the Carseldine and Darling Downs programs responded to the question concerning advantages of regular contact. Seven of these teachers reported that **there was less pressure on student teachers during regular contact:** the week's break between days of school experience gave students more time for preparation. Two teachers involved in the Carseldine program said that the absence of evaluation meant that the situation was more "natural" and that students were under less stress. Six teachers considered that an advantage of having regular contact over an extended period was that it allowed students to understand children's development during a lengthy time period. Three teachers mentioned that regular contact with a school led to a closer link between theory and practice; one teacher remarked that students could have discussions with lecturers between visits to the school. Four of the teachers who supervised students in the Carseldine programs stated that the one day per week contact allowed student teachers to become involved in a wider range of school activities than was possible during block practice.

Among the thirty-five teachers not involved with the Darling Downs or Carseldine programs who listed advantages, or possible advantages, the most commonly perceived benefit, mentioned by eleven teachers, was that **regular contact would allow student teachers to appreciate the continuity of lesson flow throughout the year, to follow a class's development over the year, or to follow up lessons taught.** Six teachers reported that regular contact prior to block practice would allow the student

teachers to become familiar with their classes and supervising teachers. Three teachers considered that regular contact allowed students to experience a greater variety of school activities "instead of only those at one time of the year". Two teachers reported that regular contact was "less formal and more natural", while a further two teachers considered that students who visited schools on a regular basis became an integral part of the school and not, to quote one teacher, "seven-day wonders".

2.2.3 School co-ordinator responses

Twelve school co-ordinators involved in the Darling Downs or Carseldine programs reported one or more advantages of regular contact. The major advantages were:

- it gives students a more realistic understanding of the whole school
- allows for continuity of teaching
- enables students to appreciate theory put into practice
- allows students to appreciate children's development over a long period of time.

Of the twenty-eight co-ordinators who gave advantages of regular contact with a school but who were not involved with regular contact students, the most common advantage mentioned was that regular contact allowed students to appreciate how a school operated on a daily basis. Seven co-ordinators gave this type of response. For example:

- lets student see more of day to day routines
- greater awareness of day to day roles of classroom teacher.

Six co-ordinators considered that long-term regular contact provided students with the opportunity to develop a greater awareness of the continuity of teaching and the sequential development of school work. It was stated by five co-ordinators that regular contact allowed student teachers to become involved in a wide range of school activities and experiences, including becoming aware of school policy, and three co-ordinators considered that long-term regular contact provided for the establishment of better relationships between student teachers and pupils and school staff.

2.2.4 Lecturer responses

The advantage of regular contact most commonly reported by the twenty-six Carseldine and Darling Downs lecturers who listed benefits was that it allowed for a closer linking of theory and practice (eighteen respondents). For instance:

- theory and practice are no longer separated as college and school work closely together
- coherence between school and college programs
- college-based curriculum and foundation studies are tied with actual school situation so theory-practice dichotomy is broken down.

Ten lecturers reported that regular contact allowed students to appreciate long-term curriculum development and/or children's development. It was reported by four members of college staff that regular contact allowed the lecturers to become more involved in the student's school experience by discussing the student's work in the college between visits.

Only fourteen lecturers who were not involved in supervising students in contact with a school on a regular basis commented on its advantages. The most common advantage, reported by six respondents, was that regular contact facilitated discussion of the student's school experience with the college or university lecturer. Three lecturers considered that regular contact allowed for a more concentrated focus on the development of specific skills in student teachers.

2.3 Disadvantages of regular contact

2.3.1 Student teacher responses

The most common disadvantages of regular contact listed by the Darling Downs and Carseldine students were:

- the difficulty of getting to know the children well (eighteen respondents)
- the lack of continuity and difficulty in following-up lessons (fifteen respondents)
- the amount of work involved (thirteen respondents)
- the "unrealistic" nature of one day per week contact (five respondents).

The main disadvantage of regular contact given by student teachers in the other programs was that **visits of one day per week did not allow for a continuous sequence of lessons to be taught.** Eighteen students mentioned this. Eight students felt that contact on a one day per week basis would not allow them to develop relationships with the children or get to know their classes well. Six students reported that block practice was more realistic; for example: regular contact "doesn't provide the experience, involvement and atmosphere that a three- or four-week block can produce".

2.3.2 Supervising teacher responses

The most common disadvantage of one day per week school experience mentioned by the Carseldine and Darling Downs supervising teachers was that **contact of one day per week made it difficult for the students to establish continuity in their teaching programs or to follow up work with pupils.** Twelve respondents reported this as a disadvantage. Six teachers said that contact of one day per week made it difficult for student teachers to establish a rapport with pupils.

Twenty-four teachers involved with the other programs commented on the disadvantages of regular contact. Nine teachers, all from the one program, reported that if the contact was on the same day each week, students lacked an overview of the teacher's program. Thirteen teachers reported that **one day per week teaching lacked continuity and therefore gave a distorted view of how a school operated.**

2.3.3 School co-ordinator responses

Seven of the school co-ordinators involved in the Darling Downs and Carseldine programs gave disadvantages of regular contact. These comments were somewhat disparate, and most were specific to the particular program with which the co-ordinator was associated. Nonetheless, three co-ordinators mentioned the fragmented nature of lessons, the lack of continuity or the difficulty in planning a sequence of work.

Sixteen co-ordinators associated with the other programs commented on disadvantages of regular contact. The major concern of these co-ordinators was again **the lack of continuity of lessons and the lack of opportunity students would have to develop units of work if contact was on a one day per week basis.**

2.3.4 Lecturer responses

Among the nine Carseldine and Darling Downs members of college staff who reported on disadvantages of regular contact, the main concerns were related to the amount of work required of lecturers, the lack of continuity of teaching and possibility for follow-up of the class by the student, and the difficulty students had establishing relationships with the teacher and pupils.

Sixteen lecturers involved in other programs gave disadvantages of regular contact. Nine of these lecturers considered that contact of one day per week lacked continuity, presented a fragmented view of teaching or did not provide student teachers with the opportunity to follow-up work they had undertaken. Two lecturers considered that block practice had the advantage of allowing student teachers to concentrate full-time on their school experience without the necessity to simultaneously spend time on their college work.

3.0 ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN IN SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

It was considered necessary that some basic information concerning student teachers' activities during school experience should be gathered. Three types of information were sought: the actual time which students spent in a number of activities, the level of satisfaction with the time spent in each of the activities and the perceived importance of the activities. Originally, it was planned to put all three types of questions to student teachers, supervising teachers and lecturers. During trialling of the questionnaires, however, several supervising teachers and lecturers expressed doubt about their knowledge of the amount of time students spent in the various activities and thus their ability to give an opinion on the level of satisfaction with the time allocation. It was therefore decided to ask these two groups of respondents only about the importance of the activities. Student teachers were still asked to respond to all three types of questions.

3.1 Time spent on various activities

A list of eighteen activities which student teachers could engage in during school experience was developed.

Student teachers were asked to estimate the amount of time which they spent each day in these activities. The estimates were made on a five-point scale (0 hours, up to 1 hour, 1-2 hours, 2-3 hours, more than 3 hours).

In estimating the amount of time spent in each activity, students were asked to take into account block practice and regular contact, if applicable. This direction created difficulty for some of the students enrolled in the Carseldine programs, which involved two distinct forms of school experience. Students were asked to include time spent outside normal school hours in their estimations.

The results for primary and secondary student teachers are shown in Table 22. As well as showing the proportion of students who indicated each time category, the approximate average number of hours per day spent by student teachers in each activity has also been given. For the purposes of calculating the mean times, up to one hour was treated as thirty minutes, 1-2 hours as one-and-a-half hours, 2-3 hours as two-and-a-half hours, and more than 3 hours as three-and-a-half hours. The average times reported should therefore be regarded as approximate, but nonetheless giving a reasonable indication of the amount of time which students spent on the various activities.

Table 22: Time spent by students per day on activities of school experience during final year

ACTIVITY	PRIMARY (N=240)						SECONDARY (N=203)					
	More than 3 hrs	2-3 hrs	1-2 hrs	Up to 1 hr	Nil	Mean (hrs: mins)	More than 3 hrs	2-3 hrs	1-2 hrs	Up to 1 hr	Nil	Mean (hrs: mins)
	%	%	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	%	
Preparation for teaching lessons, units or programs	60	28	9	2	-	3:00	52	33	10	4	-	2:50
Teaching a single lesson to the whole class	30	17	22	30	1	2:00	24	19	21	30	6	1:45
Teaching a sequence of lessons in one content area to the whole class	24	14	33	27	2	1:50	22	15	24	34	5	1:40
Observation of lessons of supervising teachers	7	19	25	36	14	1:15	2	11	37	44	6	1:05
Evaluating pupil performance	6	8	24	58	4	1:05	4	6	16	65	9	0:50
Working with small groups of pupils	6	6	23	56	9	1:00	3	4	12	54	27	0:40
Discussions with supervising teachers	4	7	26	61	2	1:00	3	6	34	55	2	1:05
Studying individual pupils	4	3	9	59	24	0:40	2	2	6	41	50	0:25
Meeting with school administrative personnel	3	2	6	71	18	0:35	*	2	6	73	17	0:30
Joint planning sessions with teachers	2	3	9	60	27	0:35	1	4	7	66	21	0:35
Making notes of lessons observed	2	1	12	55	30	0:30	*	4	8	62	26	0:30
Interaction with specialist teachers	-	1	6	61	31	0:25	1	2	5	58	35	0:25
Involvement in classroom administrative matters	*	-	4	70	25	0:25	*	*	3	54	42	0:20
Working with teacher aides	3	1	8	34	54	0:25	1	-	2	24	74	0:10
Involvement in school extra-curricular activities	*	4	8	39	48	0:25	4	1	9	49	37	0:35
Attending school staff meetings	1	-	6	36	57	0:20	1	1	3	48	48	0:20
Observation of lessons of lecturers in the school	-	1	3	20	75	0:10	-	*	1	17	82	0:05
Meetings with parents	-	1	2	18	80	0:10	-	-	*	2	98	**

* Less than 1 per cent
** Less than five minutes

In a separate question, students were required to report the number of hours per day which they spent on three activities outside school hours. In this case, the actual time, rather than ratings on a scale, was requested. For this question, students were asked to make a separate estimate for block practice and regular contact, if applicable. As students in only three of the programs were involved in regular contact, the results for out-of-school time in block practice only are given in Table 23.

Table 23: Time per day spent by student teachers outside of school hours on certain activities during block practice

ACTIVITY	PRIMARY (N=240)						SECONDARY (N=203)					
	4 hrs or more	2-3 hrs	1 hr	Up to 1 hr	Nil	Mean (hrs: mins)	4 hrs or more	2-3 hrs	1 hr	Up to 1 hr	Nil	Mean (hrs: mins)
	%	%	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	%	
Preparing lessons or programs for school experience	44	43	1	-	2	3:40	48	46	5	*	*	3:25
Involvement in school extra-curricular activities	1	4	18	21	56	0:25	1	5	23	21	50	0:30
Meetings (staff, subject, parent, etc.)	*	4	21	32	43	0:30	*	3	16	24	56	0:20

* Less than 1 per cent

When the students' estimates of the time which they spent on each activity, as shown in Table 22, are summed the total comes to more than fifteen hours per day for primary teacher education students and more than thirteen hours for secondary student teachers. Subtracting the out-of-school time, as shown in Table 23, leaves about eleven hours for primary student teachers and nine-and-a-half hours for secondary student teachers. The activities specified are, however, not mutually exclusive. For instance, there would be considerable overlap in the time spent by students observing the supervising teacher and in making notes of lessons observed. The students' estimates of the time spent on each activity therefore seem reasonable.

From Table 22, it can be seen that **the activity of school experience which took up the most time was preparing for teaching lessons, units or programs.** Sixty per cent of primary teacher education students reported spending more than three hours per day on this activity. Table 23 shows that, as expected, preparation was undertaken outside school hours. It also indicates that nearly half of the student teachers reported devoting four hours or more per day to preparation. In fact, nearly one-tenth of the students reported devoting at least six hours per day to preparation for school experience.

There was some variation among the programs, especially the primary programs, in the amount of time which students reported devoting to preparation. The lowest average time was three hours ten minutes, while students enrolled in one program reported spending, on average, four-and-a-half hours per day preparing for school experience.

Of the activities undertaken during school time, teaching activities are clearly the most time-consuming single activities. Primary student teachers reported spending an average of two hours teaching a single lesson to the whole class and just under this for teaching a sequence of lessons in one content area to the same class. For secondary student teachers, the average time in each of these activities was around one hour forty-five minutes.

There was some variation, both between and within programs, with respect to the time which students reported spending on these two items concerned with direct teaching. Indeed, overall there were substantial proportions of student teachers represented in each of the categories from "up to one hour" to "more than three hours" with respect to time spent teaching a single lesson or teaching a sequence of lessons. Concerning variation between programs, the highest average time per day reported by students for teaching a single lesson was two hours thirty minutes, while the lowest was fifty-five minutes. This latter figure was for students enrolled in the one-year primary Graduate Diploma program. These students spent a higher average time observing both supervising teachers and college lecturers.

Observation of lessons of the supervising teacher was the activity next in order of time spent. For the primary programs, the average time reported by students for observation of supervising teachers' lessons was one-and-a-quarter hours, and the average time for secondary teachers was a little less than this. Again, there was some variation in student responses overall and between and within programs. With regard to primary programs, the average time per day which students devoted to observing supervising teachers varied between thirty minutes and one hour forty minutes, while for secondary programs, the average varied from fifty minutes to one hour twenty-five minutes.

The variation between programs as well as within programs with respect to the amount of time which students spent teaching a single lesson, a sequence of lessons or observing supervising teachers indicates that the school and supervising teacher, as well as the tertiary institution, influenced the way in which students' time during school experience was allocated to these three activities.

For the remainder of the items, there was less variation overall. In all cases, the vast majority of responses fell in adjacent categories on the scale, and in many cases, a majority of responses fell into one category.

In terms of time order, the next cluster of items was concerned with evaluating pupil performances, working with small groups of pupils and discussions with supervising teachers. A majority of both primary and secondary student teachers reported spending up to one hour per day on each of these activities, with, in most cases, a significant proportion reporting that they spent more time than this. Students in primary programs reported spending more time than their secondary counterparts working with small groups of pupils.

A majority of students also reported spending up to one hour in each of the following activities:

- studying individual pupils
- meetings with school administrative personnel
- joint planning sessions with teachers
- making notes of lessons observed
- interaction with specialist teachers
- involvement in classroom administrative matters.

Reasonably large numbers of students also reported that they spent less than one hour engaged in each of the above activities.

A majority of students (or near a majority in the case of school extra-curricular activities) indicated that they had spent no time during their final-year school experience on any of the items listed below:

- working with teacher aides
- involvement in school extra-curricular activities
- attending school staff meetings
- meetings with parents
- observation of lessons of lecturers in the school.

As noted earlier, student teachers involved in the primary Graduate Diploma program reported spending a greater amount of time, on average, in observing lessons of lecturers. In fact, only two of these students said that they had not observed a college lecturer teaching in a school.

Of the 203 secondary teacher education students who responded, only four claimed that they had been involved in meetings with parents during 1982.

3.2 Desired changes to time allocated

In order that the students' satisfaction with the time spent in the activities could be judged, student teachers were asked to indicate if the time devoted to each activity was too much, about right or too little. With one exception, only a small proportion of students reported that too much time was spent on any activity: nearly all of the responses fell in the too little or about right categories. Only the proportion of students indicating that too little time was given to each of the activities is therefore shown in Table 24.

Table 24: Average time spent per day in each activity and proportion of students indicating "too little" time spent on activities

ACTIVITY	PRIMARY (N=240)		SECONDARY (N=203)	
	Mean time per day (hrs:mins)	Proportion indicating "too little"	Mean time per day (hrs:mins)	Proportion indicating "too little"
		%		%
1. Preparation for teaching lessons, units or programs	3:00	2	2:50	2
2. Teaching a single lesson to the whole class	2:00	7	1:45	8
3. Teaching a sequence of lessons in one content area to the whole class	1:50	13	1:40	14
4. Observation of lessons of supervising teachers	1:15	20	1:05	8
5. Evaluating pupil performances	1:05	26	0:50	29
6. Working with small groups of pupils	1:00	30	0:40	47
7. Discussions with supervising teachers	0:40	20	1:05	24
8. Studying individual pupils	0:40	42	0:25	49
9. Meetings with school administrative personnel	0:35	17	0:30	21
10. Joint planning sessions with teachers	0:35	42	0:35	33
11. Making notes of lessons observed	0:35	12	0:30	8
12. Interaction with specialist teachers	0:30	49	0:25	42
13. Involvement in classroom administrative matters	0:25	29	0:20	38
14. Working with teacher aides	0:25	44	0:10	45
15. Involvement in school extra-curricular activities	0:25	50	0:35	38
16. Attending school staff meetings	0:25	36	0:20	41
17. Meetings with parents	0:20	68	*	61
18. Observation of lessons of lecturers in the school	0:10	54	0:05	54

* Less than five minutes

Table 24 shows that a majority of secondary teacher education students considered that too little time was spent on the following activities:

- meetings with parents
- observation of lecturers in the school.

A majority of primary teacher education students agreed that too little time was devoted to these activities. In addition, half of this group felt that more time should be invested in involvement with extra-curricular activities.

A substantial minority (40-50 per cent) of both primary and secondary student teachers considered that more time should be given to:

- studying individual pupils
- interaction with specialist teachers
- working with teacher aides.

In addition, between 40 and 50 per cent of primary student teachers reported that more time should be spent in joint planning sessions with teachers, and a similar proportion of secondary student teachers considered that more time should be devoted to working with small groups of pupils and attending school staff meetings.

The one item on which an appreciable proportion of students indicated that "too much" time was spent was preparation for teaching lessons, units or programs. Thirty-four per cent of primary teacher education students and 17 per cent of secondary student teachers felt that they would prefer to spend less time on preparation.

3.3 Importance of the activities

Student teachers, supervising teachers and college and university staff were asked to rate the importance of each of the activities to final-year school experience. The ratings were made on a four-point scale (very important, moderately important, slightly important, unimportant). The mean scores on each item for each group of respondents are shown in Table 25.

Table 25: Opinions concerning importance* of activities in final-year school experience

ACTIVITY	PRIMARY			SECONDARY		
	Students (N=240)	Sup. tchrs (N=240)	Lecturers (N=102)	Students (N=203)	Sup. tchrs (N=193)	Lecturers (N=82)
1. Preparation for teaching lessons, units or programs	3.78	3.89	3.88	3.85	3.93	3.99
2. Teaching a single lesson to the whole class	3.36	3.24	2.95	3.36	3.12	3.13
3. Teaching a sequence of lessons in one content area to the whole class	3.62	3.90	3.78	3.73	3.93	3.90
4. Observation of lessons of supervising teachers	3.15	3.20	3.18	2.99	3.36	3.53
5. Evaluating pupil performances	3.56	3.63	3.51	3.42	3.57	3.51
6. Working with small groups of pupils	3.45	3.31	3.29	3.28	3.12	3.22
7. Discussions with supervising teachers	3.78	3.85	3.85	3.82	3.87	3.88
8. Studying individual pupils	3.22	3.06	3.22	2.97	2.79	2.96
9. Meetings with school administrative personnel	3.06	3.12	3.12	2.94	3.04	3.04
10. Joint planning sessions with teachers	3.31	3.67	3.68	3.30	3.61	3.67
11. Making notes of lessons observed	2.54	2.82	2.70	2.34	2.88	2.94
12. Interaction with specialist teachers	3.19	3.11	3.24	2.94	3.07	3.22
13. Involvement in classroom administrative matters	3.05	3.20	2.68	2.71	3.06	2.84
14. Working with teacher aides	2.79	2.68	2.64	3.28	3.12	3.22
15. Involvement in school extra-curricular activities	2.96	2.89	3.04	3.11	3.07	3.22
16. Attending school staff meetings	2.80	2.78	3.04	2.83	2.78	3.05
17. Meetings with parents	3.11	2.36	2.92	2.75	2.08	2.67
18. Observation of lessons of lecturers in the school	2.50	2.58	2.34	2.31	2.50	2.40

* Scale: 4 = very important
3 = moderately important
2 = slightly important
1 = unimportant

A striking feature of Table 25 is the close agreement among all groups of respondents (student teachers, supervising teachers, lecturers) and between those involved with primary programs and those involved with secondary programs.

Those items which were seen as most important were:

- preparation for teaching lessons, units or programs
- teaching a sequence of lessons in one content area to the same class
- discussions with supervising teachers
- evaluating pupil performance.

The mean score for most of the other items was generally above three, indicating that they were considered to be typically of at least moderate importance. The exceptions were observation of lessons of lecturers in the school and making notes of lessons observed. The mean score of between two and three for these items indicates that they were considered to be of slight to moderate importance. Primary teacher education students, supervising teachers and lecturers also considered working with teacher aides to be of slight to moderate importance, while their secondary counterparts considered this to be of moderate importance.

Turning to group differences, there are two items for those involved with primary programs that deserve comment. Lecturers rated involvement in classroom administrative matters as being of less importance than did students or teachers; supervising teachers rated meetings with parents as being of less importance than did students or tertiary staff.

Within the secondary groups, student teachers tended to rate observation of supervising teachers' lessons and making notes of observed lessons as being of less importance than did teachers or lecturers. As with the primary group, secondary teachers considered that student involvement in meetings with parents was less important than did lecturers or the student teachers themselves.

These differences are, however, relatively minor and should not obscure the close agreement concerning the importance of the activities which students should undertake during their final-year school experience.

In considering any desirable changes to the time allocated to the various activities in final-year school experience, it is important to view Tables 22 to 25 together. For instance, Table 24, considered in isolation, implies that more than half of the student teachers would prefer an increase in the time spent observing lecturers' teaching lessons in the school. Table 25, however, shows that this activity was considered relatively unimportant by student teachers and their supervisors. Indeed, in the various seminars held to discuss the results of the survey, it was felt that lecturers should not teach isolated demonstration lessons in schools, although it was felt desirable that lecturers should form long-term working relationships with particular schools and hence be better placed to teach pupils in those schools.

Nonetheless, at the seminars, there was reasonably strong agreement that students' experience in schools should be broadened so that they experienced the range of tasks which they were likely to face in their first year of teaching. It was considered therefore that time should be provided for students to:

- interact with parents
- work with teacher aides
- become involved in school extra-curricular activities
- interact with specialist teachers
- attend school staff meetings.

4.0 SETTINGS IN WHICH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE UNDERTAKEN

Student teachers were asked to indicate whether, during their course, they had undertaken school experience in certain settings. These included various year levels, team-teaching situations, open-area classrooms, composite classes, country schools and the student's teaching areas. Student teachers were also asked to rate, on a four-point scale (very important, moderately important, slightly important,

unimportant), how important it was that student teachers participated in the settings during their course. The results are summarised in Table 26.

Table 26: Proportion of student teachers with teaching experience in a number of settings, and student teacher opinion concerning importance of having experience in each setting

SETTING	PRIMARY (N=240)		SECONDARY (N=203)	
	Proportion with experience in setting	Mean importance*	Proportion with experience in setting	Mean importance*
	%		%	
Lower year levels (Primary: Years 1-2; Secondary: Year 8)	92	3.84	88	3.70
Middle year levels (Primary: Years 3-5; Secondary: Years 9-10)	97	3.79	97	3.83
Upper year levels (Primary: Years 6-7; Secondary: Years 11-12)	97	3.83	95	3.80
Team-teaching situation	54	3.33	54	3.05
Open-area classrooms	48	3.32	29	2.87
Conventional classrooms	100	3.48	99	3.50
Composite classes	58	3.47	29	2.65
Country schools	32	3.12	22	2.91
All subjects of the primary school curriculum	95	3.96	n.a.	n.a.
All student's teaching areas	n.a.	n.a.	88	3.92

* Scale: 4 = very important
3 = moderately important
2 = slightly important
1 = unimportant

As can be seen from Table 26, all or nearly all of the students in primary teacher education programs had taught across the range of year levels in the primary school, in conventional classrooms and in all subject areas of the primary school curriculum. Teaching in each of these settings was generally regarded as being of great importance, although teaching in conventional classrooms was seen as being of great or moderate importance. About half of the primary teacher education students had taught in open-area classrooms, in team-teaching situations or in composite classes. Experience in these settings was seen to be of moderate to great importance by the students. About one-third of the students in primary programs had experience in country schools. A large majority of the student teachers reported either that this type of teaching experience was of great importance (40 per cent) or that it was of moderate importance (40 per cent).

There was considerable variation among primary programs in the proportion of students who had teaching experience in certain of the settings, most notably for teaching in country schools. In one program, nearly all of the students had experience in a country school, while in some others only one or two students had had such experience. Interestingly, there was a tendency for students in programs which had a high proportion who had taught in country schools to also rate the importance of teaching in a country school more highly. The proportion of students who had taught composite classes ranged from 30 per cent to 94 per cent.

Nearly all of the students in secondary teacher education programs had taught in the middle and upper year levels of the secondary school and in conventional classrooms. Twelve per cent had not taught in Year 8, although a majority of students regarded this as being of great importance. Twelve per cent had also not taught in all of their curriculum areas, although this figure is not as alarming as it might at first seem, as in some programs students may have included a third teaching area in which they were not necessarily required to undertake practice teaching. Slightly more than half of the students in secondary programs had taught in a team-teaching situation: 81 per cent of students felt experience in this situation was of either moderate or great importance. Relatively small proportions of student teachers (20–30 per cent) had experience in open-area classrooms, in country schools or in composite classes. Teaching experience in the former two situations was generally seen to be of moderate importance, while teaching composite classes was considered by the students in the secondary programs to be of slight or moderate importance.

There were some differences among the programs, most notably for the proportion of students teaching in country schools. For the secondary programs, this ranged from none to 40 per cent. Again, there was a tendency for students in programs which had a higher proportion of students who had had some teaching experience in a country school to value experience in country schools more highly than students who had not taught in this setting.

It should be noted that students in some of the programs had not commenced their final practice at the time the survey was undertaken.

At the seminars held to discuss the results of the survey, it was generally agreed that it was desirable for students to be exposed to a variety of settings during their school experience. It was felt that tertiary institutions and schools needed to be aware of the desirability of providing students with a diversity of settings in which to teach.

5.0 ROLES OF SUPERVISING TEACHERS, LECTURERS AND SCHOOL CO-ORDINATORS

The various groups of respondents were asked to rate the frequency with which particular tasks were performed. Respondents were asked to rate each task twice: firstly, for the frequency with which the task was actually carried out; and secondly, for the frequency with which they would have liked the task to have been performed in an ideal situation. Ratings were made on a five-point scale (5 = very frequently, 4 = often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = rarely, 1 = never). In the following tables, the mean "actual" and "ideal" ratings are shown for the various items. In addition, a mean "difference" score has been calculated for each item. This is simply the result when the "actual" mean is subtracted from the "ideal" mean. The higher this mean difference score, then the more dissatisfied respondents were with the frequency with which an activity was performed. Respondents were also invited to make open-ended comments on the roles of the various personnel involved in school experience.

5.1 Role of supervising teachers

5.1.1 Student teacher responses

Student teachers were asked to rate the frequency with which supervising teachers undertook thirteen tasks and the frequency they would have liked supervising teachers to have undertaken each of the tasks. These responses are summarised in Table 27.

Table 27: Mean student teacher ratings of the actual and ideal occurrence of supervising teacher activities

	PRIMARY (N=240)			SECONDARY (N=203)		
	Actual*	Ideal*	Diff.**	Actual*	Ideal*	Diff.**
1. Supervising teachers make their expectations clear to me	3.57	4.43	.86	3.72	4.35	.63
2. Supervising teachers demonstrate particular teaching strategies and principles	3.08	4.07	.99	3.32	4.11	.79
3. Supervising teachers discuss their own lessons with me	2.37	3.76	1.39	2.91	3.91	1.00
4. Supervising teachers are involved in planning my lessons with me	2.72	3.37	.65	2.82	3.38	.56
5. Supervising teachers provide me with feedback on the lessons I teach	3.68	4.57	.89	4.04	4.60	.56
6. Supervising teachers are involved in discussing the activities I will undertake in school experience	3.57	4.16	.59	3.36	4.00	.64
7. Supervising teachers discuss their long-term curriculum plans with me	2.45	3.88	1.43	2.67	3.80	1.13
8. Supervising teachers assist me in developing long-term curriculum plans	2.29	3.78	1.49	2.24	3.64	1.40
9. Supervising teachers provide me with feedback on the implementation of my long-term curriculum plans	2.40	3.90	1.50	2.08	3.54	1.46
10. Supervising teachers provide me with sufficient notice of the lessons I have to teach	3.94	4.51	.57	4.28	4.64	.36
11. Supervising teachers encourage me to show initiative in the way I teach	3.75	4.43	.68	3.98	4.45	.47
12. Supervising teachers help to make me feel like a colleague in the school	3.76	4.66	.90	4.22	4.67	.45
13. Supervising teachers complement the role of college or university staff	3.02	4.12	1.10	3.33	3.89	.56

* Scale: 5 = very frequently
4 = often
3 = sometimes
2 = rarely
1 = never

** Difference: Ideal minus Actual

It can be seen from Table 27 that for the primary programs, six items had a mean actual rating of greater than 3.5. For the secondary programs, five of these items had a mean rating of greater than 3.5. These most frequently occurring supervising teacher behaviours, as perceived by the student teachers, were:

- supervising teachers make their expectations clear to student teachers
- supervising teachers provide student teachers with feedback on the lessons they teach
- supervising teachers provide student teachers with sufficient notice of the lessons they have to teach
- supervising teachers encourage student teachers to show initiative in the way they teach
- supervising teachers help student teachers to feel like colleagues in the school.

In addition, item 6 - supervising teachers are involved in discussing the lessons which student teachers will undertake during school experience - was rated higher than 3.5 by student teachers involved in primary programs, but just under this figure by student teachers enrolled in secondary teacher education programs.

At the other end of the scale were a number of items which student teachers reported as being undertaken least frequently. For both primary and secondary teacher education students these items, with a mean of less than 2.5, were:

- supervising teachers assist student teachers in the development of long-term curriculum plans
- supervising teachers provide student teachers with feedback on the implementation of long-term curriculum plans.

In addition to the above items, primary student teachers also rated the following two items as having a low occurrence:

- supervising teachers discuss their own lessons with student teachers
- supervising teachers discuss their long-term curriculum plans with student teachers.

The mean difference between the actual and ideal ratings was in all cases positive, indicating that, ideally, students wanted supervising teachers to undertake the tasks more frequently. The difference was greatest for items 3, 7, 8 and 9, namely:

- supervising teachers discuss their own lessons with student teachers
- supervising teachers discuss their long-term curriculum plans with student teachers
- supervising teachers assist student teachers in the development of long-term curriculum plans
- supervising teachers provide students with feedback on the implementation of their long-term curriculum plans.

The results of this question clearly indicate that students would prefer more teacher involvement in a number of areas, but most noticeably in the development of and feedback on long-term curriculum plans, and with respect to discussions with supervising teachers about their own lessons and their own long-term curriculum plans.

A large proportion of student teachers took up the invitation to comment further on the role of supervising teachers during school experience. Some students made highly favourable comments on the teachers whom they had had as supervisors, while others were quite critical of their supervising teachers. There were a small number of persistent themes running through the comments of the students.

One theme was the supervising teacher's attitude towards the student teacher. Good supervising teachers were seen to be "helpful", "supportive", "reassuring", "approachable and sympathetic" and as offering "encouragement". One student expressed these desirable attributes of supervising teachers thus:

> "The supervising teacher who is a friend to the student will be of most benefit to the student - a friend who will discuss all the nitty-gritty feelings, ups and downs the student experiences and perceives."

Good supervising teachers were seen as treating student teachers more as colleagues than as "mere students" who were "not made to feel part of the real teaching staff". A few students complained about being put in a staff room separated from the other teachers in the school.

A second theme running through the students' responses was the importance placed by the students on the provision of feedback on their teaching, and to a lesser extent, on their lesson plans. Good supervisors "pointed out weaknesses and gave suggestions; were helpful and honest in their criticism; were constructively critical; and provided feedback directly following each lesson". Conversely, many students complained that supervising teachers did not provide them with sufficient feedback on their lessons or provide them with guidance on how to improve their teaching.

A third area which many students commented upon was the freedom which teachers gave to students in the planning and implementation of lessons. Teachers who allowed students some freedom "to experiment with as many methods of teaching as possible" or provided students with "opportunities to try what they had heard or read about" were seen as good supervisors. On the other hand, teachers who expected the students to teach in a particular way, or who expected the student to adopt the supervising teacher as a role model were viewed unfavourably by the student teachers.

A large number of student teachers considered that poor communication between tertiary institutions and supervising teachers meant that many supervising teachers were not well-informed about the college's expectations of the students' or supervising teachers' roles.

5.1.2 Supervising teacher responses

Supervising teachers were also asked to indicate how frequently they engaged in a number of tasks related to final-year school experience, and how often they would prefer to be involved in them in an ideal situation. Their responses are shown in Table 28. It can be noted that items 2 to 13 in Table 28 correspond with items 1 to 12 in Table 27.

Table 28: Mean supervising teacher ratings of the actual and ideal occurrence of supervising teacher activities

	PRIMARY (N=240)			SECONDARY (N=193)		
	Actual*	Ideal*	Diff.**	Actual*	Ideal*	Diff.**
1. I consult with college or university staff concerning expectations for school experience	2.62	3.72	1.10	2.22	3.55	1.33
2. I make expectations about school experience clear to the student teachers	4.11	4.34	.23	3.87	4.25	.38
3. I demonstrate particular teaching strategies and principles to the student teachers	3.78	4.16	.38	3.83	4.21	.38
4. I discuss my own lessons with the student teachers	3.62	4.07	.45	3.87	4.19	.32
5. I am involved in planning of the student teachers' lessons with them	3.90	4.06	.16	3.85	4.04	.19
6. I provide the student teachers with feedback on the lessons they teach	4.42	4.64	.22	4.53	4.74	.21
7. I discuss with student teachers the activities they will undertake in school experience	4.32	4.51	.19	3.93	4.30	.37
8. I discuss my long-term curriculum plans with student teachers	3.48	4.00	.52	3.24	3.78	.54
9. I assist student teachers in developing long-term curriculum plans	3.16	3.80	.64	2.54	3.43	.89
10. I provide student teachers with feedback on the implementation of their long-term curriculum plans	3.07	3.84	.77	2.33	3.27	.94
11. I provide the student teachers with sufficient notice of the lessons they have to teach	4.66	4.81	.15	4.76	4.84	.08
12. I encourage the student teachers to show initiative in the way they teach	4.59	4.75	.16	4.56	4.74	.18
13. I help to make the student teachers feel like colleagues in the school	4.63	4.78	.15	4.63	4.77	.14
14. I work with college or university staff in developing solutions to problems that student teachers are experiencing	2.74	4.01	1.27	2.52	3.83	1.31

* Scale: 5 = frequently
4 = often
3 = sometimes
2 = rarely
1 = never

** Difference: Ideal minus Actual

From Table 28 it can be seen that supervising teachers in primary schools rated three items very highly (mean greater than 4.5). These activities which supervising teachers reported carrying out very frequently were:

- providing student teachers with sufficient notice of the lessons they have to teach
- encouraging student teachers to show initiative in the way they teach
- helping to make student teachers feel like colleagues in the school.

For the secondary supervising teachers, these three items, together with item 6 - providing student teachers with feedback on the lessons they teach - had a mean rating above 4.5.

Three further items were also rated relatively highly (mean greater than 4) by the primary supervising teachers. These were:

- making expectations about school experience clear to student teachers
- providing student teachers with feedback on the lessons they teach
- discussing with student teachers the activities they will undertake during school experience.

At the other end of the spectrum, both primary and secondary supervising teachers reported undertaking the following tasks least frequently:

- consulting with college or university staff concerning expectations for school experience
- working with college or university staff in developing solutions to problems that student teachers are experiencing.

In addition, secondary supervising teachers reported that they assisted student teachers in the development of long-term curriculum plans and provided students with feedback on the implementation of long-term curriculum plans relatively infrequently.

Turning to the difference columns, which show the difference between ideal and actual mean ratings for each item, it is clear that supervising teachers wanted to consult more frequently with college or university staff concerning expectations for school experience, and ideally would have liked to have worked more often with staff of tertiary institutions in developing solutions to problems that student teachers were experiencing. The supervising teachers would also have preferred to have given more help to students in the area of long-term curriculum planning.

It is interesting to compare the results in Table 28 with those in Table 27. As noted earlier, items 1 to 12 in Table 27 correspond with items 2 to 13 in Table 28. Firstly, comparing the "ideal" columns in the two tables, it can be seen that there was very close agreement between students and teachers concerning the ideal behaviours of supervising teachers. There was an exception to this close agreement for only one item - supervising teachers planning of student teachers lessons with them. Student teachers preferred that this should occur less frequently than did the teachers.

When the "actual" columns in Tables 27 and 28 are compared, it is clear that supervising teachers reported they undertook the tasks more frequently than the students reported that the teachers undertook the tasks. This "actual" difference was greatest for items 4, 5 and 8 in Table 28.

At the seminars held to discuss the questionnaire results, it was suggested that differences in perception for items 8, 9 and 10 in Table 26 could have been due to different interpretations of "long-term". It

was considered that students may have interpreted long-term as three or six weeks, i.e. the length of their block practice, whereas teachers may have interpreted it as being work covering a semester or a year.

Space was provided on the questionnaire for supervising teachers to make further comment on their role. About half of the teachers took the opportunity to comment further.

Many of the comments by teachers concerned the need to give students encouragement and support, to help them feel relaxed, and to create a climate in which students could gain confidence. Some teachers reported that it was important to make students feel part of the staff, for instance, by encouraging students to become members of the staff room.

A large number of teachers commented on the help which they had given to students in various practical teaching techniques, e.g. planning, and "how to organise a class for the smooth running of each day". Many comments were concerned with the importance that teachers attached to providing students with feedback and constructive criticism on their work. One teacher described her role in this area as follows:

> "I hold discussions with student about each lesson or block of lessons, as to strengths and weaknesses evident in each, with a view to improving performance and confidence".

Several teachers felt that students in their final year should be given opportunities to try out ideas themselves and experiment with a range of teaching styles. It was argued by some teachers that the role of the supervising teacher depended to some extent on the student. For instance, "some students need more help or direction than others, some need more observation, others more teaching practice".

There were many comments by teachers concerning the limited or inadequate time they had in which to hold discussions with student teachers. One teacher summed up the feelings of many when he wrote, "time has proved a major reason for ideals not being reached". Another teacher expressed her frustration at not being able to spend more time with student teachers:

> "I sometimes feel frustration because I am so snowed under with clerical work, assessment, etc. that I am unable to give the student all the feedback I would like to and she needs".

Several teachers suggested that there should be some time set aside in the teacher's timetable for discussion with the student during which neither the student nor the teacher would have class commitments.

A number of teachers considered that there was inadequate contact or liaison with college or university staff. This lack of contact, at its most extreme, was described in the following way by one supervising teacher:

> "College staff did not arrive until the third week of a three-week block. Prior to this, no communication between the school and the college had occurred".

5.2 Role of lecturers

The role of tertiary staff during school experience was examined in a similar way to the role of supervising teachers. Student teachers and lecturers were asked to rate a number of parallel items twice: indicating firstly the frequency with which lecturers actually undertook the activity and secondly, the frequency with which the lecturers should have undertaken the activity in an ideal situation.

The results on the role of the lecturer may be coloured by the fact that in some institutions, there are two types of lecturers with differing roles: curriculum studies lecturers, and "liaison lecturers" whose responsibility it was to liaise between the student, school and tertiary institution. Most of the lecturers selected in the sample were curriculum studies lecturers.

5.2.1 Student teacher responses

The mean actual and ideal ratings given by student teachers for each of the activities are shown in Table 29.

Table 29: Mean student teacher ratings of the actual and ideal frequency of activities of lecturers

	PRIMARY (N=240)			SECONDARY (N=203)		
	Actual*	Ideal*	Diff.**	Actual*	Ideal*	Diff.**
1. College or university staff make their expectations about school experience clear to me	3.26	4.53	1.27	3.14	4.25	1.11
2. College or university staff demonstrate particular teaching strategies and principles by teaching lessons in the school	1.50	3.46	1.96	1.34	3.11	1.77
3. College or university staff discuss lessons that they take in the school with me	1.62	3.40	1.78	1.55	3.24	1.69
4. College or university staff are involved in discussing with me the activities I will undertake in school experience	2.95	3.96	1.01	2.47	3.71	1.24
5. College or university staff observe my teach-in the school	3.07	3.69	.62	2.93	3.52	.59
6. College or university staff provide me with feedback on the lessons I teach	3.33	4.14	.81	3.51	4.11	.60
7. College or university staff assist me in the development of long-term curriculum plans	2.42	3.73	1.31	2.20	3.58	1.38
8. College or university staff provide me with feedback on the implementation of my long-term curriculum plans	2.30	3.73	1.43	1.93	3.45	1.52
9. College or university staff encourage me to show initiative in the way I teach	3.43	4.21	.78	3.58	4.09	.51
10. College or university staff complement the role of the supervising teachers	2.89	4.02	1.13	2.94	3.86	.92

* Scale: 5 = very frequently
4 = often
3 = sometimes
2 = rarely
1 = never

** Difference: Ideal minus Actual

The "actual" columns in Table 29 show that primary student teachers reported that lecturers undertook four of the activities, on average, at least sometimes. These were:

- making their expectations about school experience clear to student teachers
- observing student teachers teaching in the school
- providing student teachers with feedback on the lessons they teach
- encouraging student teachers to show initiative in the way they teach.

The secondary student teachers' perceptions of their lecturers' frequency of involvement in the above four activities was similarly rated as occurring at least sometimes. The highest rating given by student teachers was 3.58, indicating that students felt that lecturers performed these activities between sometimes and often.

Two activities were rated as occurring very infrequently by the student teachers. These were:

- college or university staff demonstrate particular teaching strategies or principles by teaching lessons in the school
- college or university staff discuss lessons that they take in the school with student teachers.

In fact, three-quarters of the students reported that, during the year, they had never observed a member of the college or university staff demonstrate a particular teaching strategy by teaching a lesson in the school.

When the "difference" column is examined, it is clear that student teachers would ideally like much more involvement of lecturers in their school experience. Relatively speaking, students were most satisfied with the role of the lecturers in items 5, 6 and 8, i.e. observing the students' teaching, providing the students with feedback, and encouraging student teachers to show initiative in the way they teach. They were most dissatisfied with the frequency with which the lecturers taught lessons in the school and discussed these lessons with the student teachers. It should be noted, nonetheless, that the mean difference score was also more than one scale category for items 1, 4, 7, 8 and 10.

Three-quarters of the student teachers responded to the invitation to make further remarks on the role played by college or university lecturers during school experience.

The overwhelming majority of these comments were critical of lecturers. Most of these criticisms related to the lack of involvement of lecturers in the schools with student teachers. In particular, the small amount of time which lecturers spent observing students in the classroom was seen to limit the lecturer's consequent ability to make a valid assessment of a student's teaching performance. Typical comments were:

- "as lecturers rarely see you teach they should have no say in your final rating, except in the case of moderation among prac. schools"
- "because they are there for only a short time they can have no clear idea of the work done or the standard of the student"
- "lecturers should spend more time at school and observe more lessons so that they get a clearer picture of your capabilities"
- "lecturers observe fragments of lessons and make judgments on these often unfairly"
- "what validity can a report on you have when it is based on forty minutes out of an entire year?".

Students also considered that lecturers were unable to make fair judgments because they had little or no knowledge of the children in the student's class and the nature of the overall program which the student was trying to implement with the pupils. Another common complaint with respect to assessment was that lessons on which students were assessed were often "staged", "forced" or "artificial" because of the lecturer's presence and that this made the lesson unrepresentative of the student's teaching abilities.

There were calls by some students for lecturers to teach more demonstration lessons in schools. Some students claimed that "lecturers never gave demonstration lessons or taught a class in a regular classroom situation". It was also claimed that lecturers had "unrealistic expectations of the innovative possibilities open to student teachers". According to the students, problems of this nature would be overcome if lecturers taught more demonstration lessons in schools or tried to implement their theories in a classroom situation.

A related criticism made of lecturers by student teachers was that they were "out of touch" with the realities of schools. It was claimed, for instance, that because lecturers had not taught in a school for many years, they were "unsuitable as assessors of prac.", that "most of their comments were impractical and of no use to students", that they had "unrealistic expectations as to what students would be doing in each lesson or the school as a whole" or that lecturers possessed "idealistic views of teaching".

Other criticisms made by student teachers, but made relatively infrequently, concerned the lack of communication between lecturers and supervising teachers, the paucity of feedback provided to student teachers by lecturers and the inappropriateness of this feedback.

On the other hand, those students who commented favourably on the lecturer's role most often pointed to the usefulness of the feedback which lecturers gave students. Typical comments were:

- "feedback provided was constructive and practical"
- "explicit in their criticisms"
- "criticism they offer is useful".

Other favourable comments made by students were of a more general nature, e.g. lecturers were described as "helpful", "supporting" or "encouraging".

One student summed up her perception of good lecturers as follows:

> "Good ones let you know what they expect, critically appraise you according to the semester you are in (i.e. actually observe your lessons and discuss them with you), give suggestions where appropriate and generally make you feel you're not wasting their time by dropping in".

5.2.2 Lecturer responses

The mean ratings given by tertiary staff to the items concerned with their activities during final-year school experience are shown in Table 30.

Table 30: Mean lecturer ratings of the actual and ideal frequency of activities of lecturers

	PRIMARY (N=102)			SECONDARY (N=75)		
	Actual*	Ideal*	Diff.**	Actual*	Ideal*	Diff.**
1. I consult with school supervisory staff concerning expectations for school experience	3.76	4.30	.54	3.59	4.17	.58
2. I make expectations about school experience clear to student teachers	3.97	4.38	.41	4.31	4.44	.13
3. I demonstrate particular teaching strategies and principles by teaching lessons in the school	1.82	2.88	1.06	1.83	3.04	1.21
4. I discuss lessons which I take in the school with student teachers	2.03	3.01	.98	2.19	3.38	1.19
5. I discuss with student teachers the activities they will undertake in school experience	3.94	4.24	.30	3.95	4.29	.34
6. I observe student teachers teaching in the school	4.29	4.52	.23	4.46	4.62	.16
7. I provide student teachers with feedback on the lessons they teach during school experience	4.51	4.67	.16	4.80	4.83	.03
8. I assist student teachers with the development of long-term curriculum plans	3.25	3.82	.57	3.24	3.88	.64
9. I provide student teachers with feedback on the implementation of their long-term curriculum plans	3.09	3.83	.74	3.04	3.78	.74
10. I encourage student teachers to show initiative in the way they teach	4.50	4.63	.13	4.51	4.65	.14
11. I work with supervising teachers in developing solutions to problems the student teachers are experiencing	3.83	4.30	.53	4.00	4.44	.44

* Scale: 5 = very frequently
4 = often
3 = sometimes
2 = rarely
1 = never

** Difference: Ideal minus Actual

Considering firstly the "actual" columns in Table 30, it can be seen that for nine of the eleven items, the lecturers' mean rating was more than 3, indicating that the lecturers reported being involved in the activities at least sometimes. Indeed, for six of the items (items 2, 5, 6, 7, 10 and 11), the mean rating was very nearly 4 or more, indicating a reported lecturer involvement of often or even more frequent involvement. These most commonly occurring activities as reported by the lecturers were:

- making expectations about school experience clear to student teachers

- discussing with student teachers the activities they will undertake in school experience
- observing student teachers teaching in the school
- providing student teachers with feedback on the lessons they teach during school experience
- encouraging student teachers to show initiative in the way they teach
- working with supervising teachers in developing solutions to problems that student teachers are experiencing.

Lecturers were relatively satisfied with their level of involvement in each of these activities, although ideally they would have liked to have provided students with more feedback on the implementation of their long-term curriculum plans, to have more frequently assisted students in the development of long-term curriculum plans and to have worked with supervising teachers in developing solutions to problems student teachers were experiencing more often. The lecturers also reported that they would have preferred to consult with school supervisory personnel a little more frequently than they actually did.

For items 3 and 4, the mean actual rating was relatively low, and there was also a relatively high discrepancy between actual and ideal ratings. These two activities which lecturers reported performing rarely, but which they would have liked to have performed more frequently were:

- demonstrating particular teaching strategies and principles by teaching lessons in the school
- discussing lessons lecturers take in the school with student teachers.

Comparing the students' and lecturers' responses to parallel items in Table 29 (items 1-9) and Table 30 (items 2-10), it is interesting to note that the students' perception of the frequency with which lecturers undertook each activity was often of the order of one category on the scale lower than the lecturers' response. This might be explained by the fact that, as each lecturer supervised a number of student teachers, each lecturer undertook a particular task relatively frequently overall, but relatively infrequently with each individual student teacher.

The ideal mean ratings of students and lecturers were closer, and again the lecturers' ratings were often higher than those of the students. This was particularly so for the items concerning lecturers observing student teachers teaching in the school and providing students with feedback on these observed lessons.

Responses to the first and last items in Table 30 can be compared with responses to complementary items in Table 28. These items show that teachers reported that there was less frequent collaboration between teachers and lecturers than lecturers themselves reported. Again, however, it must be recognised that one lecturer would have been interacting with a number of different supervising teachers.

Two-thirds of the lecturers commented further on their role during school experience. There was little commonality in the responses. Lecturers variously described their role as liaising between the student and the supervising teacher or between the tertiary institution and schools, acting in a public relations capacity, providing advice, guidance, encouragement and support to student teachers, discussing with students the teaching strategies they would implement, moderating grades and so on. Some lecturers said that it would be improper for them to interfere with the professional relationship between student teachers and supervising teachers. Others said that ideally a team approach among student teacher, supervising teacher and lecturer was desirable, such that all three were jointly responsible for a class over a long period, although one lecturer said that time constraints made

this impossible. A number of other lecturers also mentioned time constraints and the large number of student teachers which they had to supervise as limiting the attention which they could give to each student teacher. Some lecturers stated that during school experience they still had administrative duties and teaching commitments at the tertiary institution.

One item provoked a deal of comment from lecturers. This was the issue of teaching demonstration lessons in schools. It was generally felt that lecturers should take demonstration lessons only if they knew the pupils in the class and the teacher's program well so that they could plan their lessons and teach appropriately. One lecturer who was supportive of more lecturer involvement in school experience generally and more teaching by lecturers in the school summed up this position as follows:

> "I worked on secondment for one year as a primary teacher in a local school, with all the responsibilities of that position. I consider the lecturers who dash in, do their own ego trip with a primary grade and dash out, leaving the regular teacher to 'clean up the mess', give students completely the wrong idea of the responsibilities of primary teaching."

This view of the role of lecturers in teaching demonstration lessons in schools was reinforced in the seminars held to discuss the results of the project.

5.2.3 Changes to allow lecturers to spend more time in school experience

In a separate question, lecturers were asked if they would prefer to spend more time involved in school experience, and if so, what would be needed to allow them to spend more time. Just over 60 per cent of the college and university staff members stated that they would prefer to be more involved in school experience. More than half of these respondents reported that they would need fewer commitments at the tertiary institution, i.e. reduced teaching and/or administrative load, to be able to devote more time to school experience. Nine lecturers said that they would be able to spend more time in schools if they had fewer students.

A number of other factors that would allow lecturers to spend more time involved in school experience were also mentioned, but less frequently, by the lecturers. These included:

- restructuring of the timetable
- more time allowed in timetable for school-based activities
- recognition of time spent in school experience when calculating staffing allocations
- finance to employ part-time lecturers while tertiary staff are involved with school experience
- having contact with a small number of schools only
- less emphasis on research as a criterion for promotion
- permission of schools, positive attitude in the schools to lecturers
- scheduling more school experience for student teachers.

5.3 Role of school co-ordinators

A similar approach was used to examine the role of school co-ordinators as was used to examine the role of lecturers and supervising teachers. In this case, however, only the school co-ordinators themselves were asked to rate their "actual" and "ideal" roles. In addition to the forced-choice items, co-ordinators were also asked, in a free response question, to describe their role.

A summary of the school co-ordinators' ratings of their "actual" and "ideal" roles is given in Table 31. The items used in this table were taken mainly from the list of duties prescribed for school co-ordinators in the industrial agreement concerning practice teaching in government schools.

Table 31: Mean school co-ordinator ratings of the actual and ideal frequency of activities of school co-ordinators

	PRIMARY (N=129)			SECONDARY (N=99)		
	Actual*	Ideal*	Diff.**	Actual*	Ideal*	Diff.**
1. I interpret the objectives of the program to school personnel	3.45	3.81	.36	3.52	3.88	.36
2. I determine for each student the most suitable experience for achieving these objectives	3.11	3.58	.47	3.56	3.87	.31
3. I arrange the initial orientation of students to the organisation of the school	4.62	4.66	.04	4.74	4.75	.01
4. I allocate students to appropriate supervising teachers	4.39	4.63	.24	4.84	4.86	.02
5. I organise the program for student teachers while they are not under direct supervision of supervising teachers	3.57	3.80	.23	3.88	3.91	.03
6. I advise student teachers and supervising teachers on aspects of the program	3.71	3.98	.27	4.00	4.20	.20
7. I review and consolidate assessment of students' progress for transmission to the institution	4.33	4.50	.17	4.63	4.71	.08
8. I confer with representatives of the institution on aspects of the program	3.83	4.16	.33	3.83	4.28	.45
9. I attend to payment with respect to supervision	3.89	3.79	-.10	4.81	4.41	-.40

* Scale: 5 = very frequently
4 = often
3 = sometimes
2 = rarely
1 = never

** Difference: Ideal minus Actual

Table 31 shows that co-ordinators involved with both primary and secondary teacher education programs undertook the following activities most frequently:

- arranging the initial orientation of students to the organisation of the school
- allocating students to appropriate supervising teachers
- reviewing and consolidating assessment of students' progress for transmission to the institution.

In addition, co-ordinators in secondary schools reported that they attended to payment with respect to supervision very frequently. The rating of this item was lower for primary school co-ordinators because all of the co-ordinators involved with the McAuley program stated that they never attended to payment with respect to supervising - supervising teachers involved with this program were not paid for supervision.

The "difference" scores indicate that overall the co-ordinators were satisfied with their role during school experience. There was perhaps a slight hint of dissatisfaction with the frequency with which the co-ordinators performed the activities described in items 1, 2 and 8.

There was a deal of commonality in the co-ordinators' responses when they were asked to describe their role. The co-ordinators stated that they arranged for an initial orientation of student teachers to the school (many co-ordinators mentioned school philosophy, policy, programs and routines); conducted introductory lectures for student teachers; liaised with the tertiary institution and tertiary staff; allocated students to supervising teachers; assisted in the assessment of student teachers; undertook administrative duties associated with school experience; monitored the progress of student teachers (many co-ordinators mentioned observation of student teachers' lessons); and provided guidance and assistance to student teachers, including pastoral support. Most of the co-ordinators in the secondary schools stated that they arranged the student teachers' timetables for them. Mentioned somewhat less frequently by the co-ordinators were briefing the supervising teachers about the school experience program and assisting supervising teachers, particularly those who had problems.

Some co-ordinators mentioned other activities apart from the common ones listed above. A small number of school co-ordinators, in some cases a single co-ordinator, reported undertaking the following activities:

- arranging for student teachers to meet members of the school staff
- monitoring of effects of student presence on classrooms
- teaching demonstration lessons
- liaising among supervising teachers
- meeting with student teachers and supervising teachers to discuss problems.

6.0 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY STUDIES AND SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

Student teachers, supervising teachers and college and university lecturers were asked several questions concerning the extent of relationship between student teachers' studies on campus and their school experience, including questions as to how a more meaningful relationship might be achieved.

6.1 Student teacher responses

6.1.1 Extent of relationship

Students were asked to indicate the extent to which school experience was used as a focus in campus lectures, both before and after school experience.

Table 32 shows that students felt that school experience was focused upon to a little to moderate extent both before school experience and after it. The results were very similar for primary and secondary students, although the primary students reported less of a relationship after school experience than did the secondary students.

The variation in responses among individual programs was considerable; for example, the proportions ranged between 19 per cent and 71 per cent in the great and moderate categories combined for before school experience, and between 30 per cent and 85 per cent in the same categories for after school experience. The highest responses in these two categories came from the same program (a college secondary program) in both cases.

Table 32: Student teacher opinion of the extent of focus on school experience in campus lectures

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=240)		SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=203)	
	N	%	N	%
(i) Before school experience				
. great extent	20	8	14	7
. moderate extent	92	39	72	36
. little extent	112	47	101	50
. not at all	13	5	14	7
(ii) After school experience				
. great extent	23	10	24	12
. moderate extent	85	36	90	45
. little extent	114	48	69	34
. not at all	13	6	18	9

In response to a further question, a large majority of the student teachers in each program (77 per cent to 100 per cent) answered that they considered there should be a more meaningful relationship between school experience and campus lectures.

Students' opinion was also sought on the extent of relationship between school experience and the various areas of campus study. Responses are depicted in Table 33.

Table 33: Student teacher opinion of the extent of relationship between school experience and four areas of campus study, and opinion as to whether a closer relationship should exist

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS			SECONDARY PROGRAMS		
	Extent of relationship*	Closer relationship should exist		Extent of relationship*	Closer relationship should exist	
		N	%		N	%
Curriculum studies	2.97	185	77	2.98	161	79
Foundation studies	2.37	172	72	2.29	146	72
Liberal studies	2.42	161	67	2.37	149	73
Microteaching/ teaching process	2.87	171	71	2.84	154	76

* Scale: 4 = great extent
3 = moderate extent
2 = little extent
1 = no relationship

It can be seen that the responses of the primary students and those of the secondary students were very similar. In each case, the closest relationship (moderate) was noted for curriculum studies, closely followed by microteaching/teaching process, and the least relationship (slightly above little) for foundation studies. A clear majority of students in all four cases considered there should be a greater relationship between these areas and school experience.

6.1.2 Focus on school experience in campus lectures

Student respondents were asked to comment on the ways in which school experience was used as a focus in campus lectures. A very small

proportion of students did not comment. Some of those who did referred explicitly to the way this was done before and/or after school experience; in some other cases the timing relative to school experience could be surmised.

References to the situation prior to school experience were made by about a quarter of those who responded to this question. They mentioned references during lectures to situations students might encounter during their school experience, explanations in lectures or special briefing sessions as to what was expected of students during school experience, pointing out in lectures or workshops ideas or strategies which might be useful at the practice and factors to look for while at "prac.", development or collection of resources to be used during teaching practice, assistance with preparation and planning (e.g. preparation of units or lesson plans in curriculum subjects), and reference in curriculum lectures to content to be taught and different ways to teach it.

Rather more students mentioned the situation after school experience. Ways indicated in which school experience was used as a focus included the following: informal discussions about school experience including reference to both "good" and "bad" moments, where things went wrong, how one coped, how things could have been improved, what one learned from the practice, and so forth; a one-lesson "debriefing" or a lecture devoted to general group discussion of the practice just completed; questioning of students in lectures about their school experience (e.g. lecturers asked if anyone had encountered particular situations about which they were lecturing); students speaking in seminar groups or tutorials on their experiences; feedback and buzz sessions; use of practical experience as examples to illustrate various concepts. Students in one program mentioned a practicum review week or block of two or three days set aside to discuss students' experiences and for self-evaluation.

In some cases students' comments did not refer to the situation solely before or solely after school experience. Such responses referred mainly to the use of passing references or examples to support a point the lecturer was making, or to the lecturer relating how certain techniques would operate in a particular situation.

Several respondents indicated that the degree of focusing on practice varied among subjects or depended on the particular lecturer.

A number of students mentioned particular subjects or groups of subjects (e.g. curriculum studies, method subjects, professional, education or foundation subjects) in their program. For example: "some content subjects make reference to prac. throughout the year, e.g. syllabus comparison".

Assignments relating to or based on school experience were noted by a small proportion of respondents. Examples given included the following: using the class for an assignment (e.g. analysing a sample of pupils' writing), assignments geared towards use when teaching (e.g. lesson plans), and assignments based on a unit or lesson taught in the block practice.

Many of those responding to this question appeared to be dissatisfied with the extent to which school experience was focused upon; they indicated that school experiences were discussed only briefly or not at all, or not effectively; for example: "lecturers are not interested in such matters", "usually the lecture does not lend itself to questioning about an actual school experience", "both areas are kept quite separate", "on the day we get back to college we talk about it in lectures and then it is virtually forgotten", "details gained during prac. are never discussed in lectures, only fictional situations that lecturers imagine exist in schools", "there could be a lot more relevance", "hardly ever, which makes the practice seem to be in a vacuum".

6.1.3 Differences in expectations between supervising teachers and lecturers

Student teachers were also asked to rate the frequency with which differences occurred in the expectations of them between supervising teachers and lecturers. A rating was required in each of four areas of school experience. Table 34 summarises the students' responses.

Table 34: Student teacher opinion of the frequency of differences in expectations between lecturers and supervising teachers

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=240) Mean*	SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=203) Mean*
Range of activities students are expected to undertake in school experience	3.00	2.84
Nature of preparation required for lessons	3.20	3.00
Way pupils should be taught	3.45	3.37
Standard required for a particular rating of student's school experience	3.12	2.88

* Scale: 5 = very frequently
4 = often
3 = sometimes
2 = rarely
1 = never

The average mean for the four areas is a little above 3.0 (3.19 for the primary programs and 3.02 for the secondary programs), indicating that students perceived, on average, a difference in expectations between teachers and lecturers to occur sometimes. The mean frequency varied a little (range: 3.00 to 3.45 primary, 2.84 to 3.37 secondary) among the four areas, but in both primary and secondary programs, the frequency of perceived differences was highest among the four areas for "the way pupils should be taught".

Across all fourteen programs, the lowest and highest mean ratings for each area were as follows: range of activities students are expected to undertake - 2.37 and 3.58; nature of preparation required for lessons - 2.63 and 3.55; way pupils should be taught - 3.07 and 3.80; and standard required for a particular rating - 2.47 and 3.44. When the four area ratings are averaged for each program, the program with the lowest overall frequency of differences (a three-year primary program with block practices only) had an average frequency of 2.74 and that with the highest, 3.50 (a three-year primary program with school experience of one day per week).

6.1.4 Suggestions for achieving a more meaningful relationship

A question was put to students as to how a more meaningful relationship between school experience and campus studies might be achieved.

Most of the students in each program gave suggestions here.

The responses referred largely to making campus lectures more practically-oriented; for example: "by relating the theory to our experiences in prac.", "by lecturing more about the realities of teaching and less about theories which prove to be ineffective", by "discussing practical issues, e.g. how to discipline, how to manage classrooms". This included aspects such as more orientation in lectures towards the school curriculum, more lectures on methods suitable for use in schools, more

demonstration of teaching strategies and of use of audio-visual aids, more emphasis on how to teach the content or skill rather than on just learning it, and more indication of content applicable for different year levels.

Numbers of students considered their lecturers to be out of touch with, or not interested in schools. These students thought it would be beneficial if lecturers returned to teach in schools occasionally (e.g. every few years), or at least made frequent visits to local schools, so that they could see what was being taught and appreciate such matters as the ability levels of children and the preparation required. It was also seen as desirable for lecturers to become more involved in schools during student teachers' practice sessions, for example by visiting the student teachers at school more often. Some students recommended that the college employ lecturers who had more teaching experience, and some that lecturers give demonstration lessons in schools.

A further group of responses concerned the amount and type of school experience open to the students. By far **the most common suggestion here was that student teachers should have regular contact with schools** (e.g. one day a week). While some felt this contact should be on an informal, non-assessable basis, with students visiting purely in order to become more familiar with school life and acting only in an aide capacity in the classroom, others suggested that assignments be based on work carried out during such contact. Also suggested, by a few respondents in each case, were a teaching apprenticeship or a professional semester, devoting more time to practice teaching, and spending more time actually teaching in the schools.

Another fairly popular suggestion was that there be more discussion of school experience, particularly after block practices. For example, students called for meetings to discuss various aspects of the experience, for two or three days to be set aside for discussion of practice teaching, for the first lecture in each subject after the practice to be centred on discussion of the practice, and for discussions or tutorials in the first two weeks back at college.

More liaison between school or teachers and college or university lecturers was recommended by several respondents. Suggestions included more interchange of information, better communication by lecturers of the college's requirements and expectations of the practice and of teachers, more joint planning, and more discussion so that teachers and lecturers came to a closer agreement on standards expected of student teachers.

Other suggestions in this section included the following: assessment related to school experience (e.g. assignments, such as writing a Current Curriculum Program (CCP), which could be used as resources during a practice); more use of experienced classroom teachers on campus (e.g. as guest lecturers, to talk about their subject areas or teaching methods, or to give demonstration lessons); and more time spent at college on planning of lessons and CCPs to be used during the practice (some suggested that time be set aside before the practice to enable student teachers to prepare, plan, and gather appropriate information and resources).

6.2 Supervising teacher responses

6.2.1 Extent of relationship

Supervising teachers were asked to indicate to what extent it was evident that student teachers used during school experience what they had learnt at college or university.

As Table 35 shows, the majority of supervising teachers considered this was evident to a moderate extent, although a quarter responded in the little extent category.

Table 35: Supervising teacher opinion of the extent to which it was evident that student teachers used their college/university learning during school experience

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=240)		SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=193)	
	N	%	N	%
Great extent	38	17	24	14
Moderate extent	124	55	106	60
Little extent	60	25	43	24
Not at all	4	2	4	2

Responses varied somewhat from program to program; the lowest and highest proportions of teachers responding in each category were 6 per cent and 36 per cent for great, 42 per cent and 75 per cent for moderate, 7 per cent and 39 per cent for little, and nil and 10 per cent for none.

6.2.2 Suggestions for achieving a more meaningful relationship

When asked whether they considered that there should be a more meaningful relationship between school experience and campus studies, nearly all the teachers (nearly 90 per cent overall) responded in the affirmative.

Most of these teachers gave suggestions when asked how such a relationship could be achieved. The teachers' suggestions were similar to those given by the students.

Many teachers - about a third of those who made suggestions here, including some in every program - saw a need for college or university lecturers to have more, or more recent or regular, experience of school situations. While some respondents indicated merely that lecturers should be more aware of what went on in schools today, others felt that lecturers should actually return to teach in schools on a regular basis in order to "bring them back to the realities of teaching" and, particularly, to keep them in touch with the changing attitudes of school students. There were also numbers of calls for college and university staff to make more frequent visits to schools during the practice period, and to become more involved in school experience. Several teachers thought lecturers should give demonstration lessons in schools for student teachers in order to show how theories could be put into practice.

The second most frequent group of suggestions concerned campus lectures. There were general calls for lectures to be made more practically oriented, to be more related to the actual school situation, and to be less theoretical. There were also more specific suggestions regarding the content of lectures. It was suggested that greater emphasis be placed on school syllabuses and background subject matter; planning of units and lessons; various methods of teaching; coping with various situations such as large classes, small groups, and slow learners; methods of discipline and classroom management; and ideas on how to approach topics in the syllabus.

There was a widespread feeling among supervising teachers that the relationship between school experience and campus studies would be enhanced if there was more liaison between teachers and lecturers. For example, the teacher respondents wanted to have brief meetings with lecturers prior to the practice sessions, regular discussions with them concerning the student's progress during the session, feedback from them about the practice, and seminars or meetings to discuss the college's objectives or intentions for school experience. A number of

teachers said they would like to be more aware of what was being taught to student teachers at the teacher education institution, and suggested teachers be given course outlines or visit the institution for briefing on its activities.

That student teachers should spend more time in schools was recommended by a number of supervising teachers. They suggested more time for practice teaching, more frequent involvement in schools, and regular contact with schools.

Involvement of practising teachers in the campus component of the program was seen as desirable by several respondents. The types of involvement proposed included guest lecturing on various topics (e.g. curriculum, discipline), question and answer sessions on teaching, and workshops on practical aspects of teaching.

A small number of teachers in six programs suggested that the colleges should follow up student teachers' practice time with discussions or debriefing sessions focusing on discussion of problems, giving advice, and developing lesson preparation and observation.

A few people (three programs) suggested that assignments be based on, or used in, school experience.

6.3 Lecturer responses

6.3.1 Extent of relationship

Table 36 provides lecturers' responses to a question seeking their opinion of the extent to which campus lectures used school experience as a focus. Overall, lecturers considered the extent of this focus to be moderate to great both before and after school experience. There was a tendency for lecturers in the primary programs to regard the focus as occurring to a lesser extent, both before and after school experience, than was the case with the secondary program lecturers.

Table 36: Lecturer opinion of the extent of focus on school experience in campus lectures

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=102)		SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=82)	
	N	%	N	%
(i) Before school experience				
. great extent	30	31	28	35
. moderate extent	47	49	43	54
. little extent	16	17	7	9
. not at all	3	3	1	1
(ii) After school experience				
. great extent	31	32	33	41
. moderate extent	43	45	40	49
. little extent	19	20	7	9
. not at all	3	3	1	1

Variation across individual programs was notable. For the "before school experience" situation, the proportions responding in the great and in the moderate categories ranged from 15 per cent to 58 per cent and from 32 per cent to 75 per cent respectively. The corresponding ranges for the post-school experience situation were 14 per cent to 63 per cent and 26 per cent to 64 per cent.

6.3.2 Focus on school experience in campus lectures

Lecturers were asked to comment on how school experience was used as a focus in lectures. All or nearly all the respondents in each program commented.

Some variation in the degree to which school experience was used as a focus was apparent both within and among programs. A few lecturers in liberal studies and foundation studies areas pointed out that a direct relationship was not appropriate in the area in which they lectured. Several others (mainly in curriculum areas and areas such as Psychology and Teaching Process) claimed that all they did in lectures was strongly related to practice.

Some of the respondents mentioned campus activities other than lectures - for example, seminars, tutorials, workshops, microteaching, group discussions, and individual consultations.

As was the case with student teacher responses to the same question (section 6.1.1), a number of respondents referred explicitly or implicitly to the situations before and/or after school experience.

The major means indicated by those not specifying a particular time in relation to school experience was "constant", "incidental", or "explicit" reference to classroom situations or the use of examples from school experience (the lecturer's or the students') to illustrate particular points.

Also mentioned, by smaller numbers of lecturers in each case, were: microteaching, role playing and simulation activities; and use of resource materials such as teaching programs, tapes, and curriculum materials.

Other means such as use of school personnel as guest lecturers and the giving by the lecturer of demonstration lessons (e.g. with children transported to the college) were each mentioned by only one or two lecturers in one or two programs.

Those referring to the situation before students' school experience sessions mentioned preparing students for the practice by: informing them of what to expect (e.g. changes they could expect since they were at school themselves, what would be expected of them by supervising teachers and school pupils) and forewarning them of potential pitfalls or explaining problems that may be encountered; method lectures and demonstrations, sequencing of the method program to ensure the basic skills were available to students before their first practice; the setting of assignments with a view to their usefulness during school experience; microteaching; discussion of curriculum units; and discussion of possible strategies for teaching various kinds of material or for teaching to particular year levels. However, **the most commonly indicated type of preparation concerned planning and preparation of actual lessons or units** (in most cases it was indicated that these were for use during the students' school experience). Lecturers mentioned discussing or giving help with such planning, and providing time for collaborative planning in student seminars.

Responses referring to campus activities after school experience sessions mainly mentioned means such as class or group discussion of students' experiences or "debriefing", "follow-up" or "feedback" sessions. It appears that these discussions focused largely on the problems or difficulties students faced during the practice and the extent to which objectives for the practice were achieved. Some lecturers mentioned suggesting to students alternative strategies to overcome such problems. A number of lecturers said they encouraged the sharing of students' experiences - for example "use of other students' experience of their individual schools", "allowing students to tell of their experiences in relation to the topic in question", "encouraging students to relate their school experiences to each other", and "seminars where groups of students

report in turn on their experience".

Assignments related to experiences encountered during the practice sessions, or the writing up and discussion of case studies of pupils, classes or schools or of curriculum units experienced at the practice were mentioned by a small number of respondents. Student reports and evaluations of teaching practice were listed by one or two people.

Other means mentioned, by small numbers of people in each case, were: reconstruction after the practice of student lessons observed during the practice; analysis of video tapes of lessons taught by student teachers; small-group tutorials discussing the relation of lectures and readings to the practice students had observed or undertaken; and modification of the lecture program to improve areas of student weakness.

6.3.3 Suggestions for achieving a more meaningful relationship

Lecturers were asked whether they considered school experience and campus lectures should be more meaningfully related, and if so, how this could be done.

For all but one of the programs the proportion of lecturers considering that there should be a more meaningful relationship was greater than 63 per cent, and in more than half the programs all or nearly all lecturers had this view. In one program the proportion seeing a more meaningful relationship as desirable was only 36 per cent. Several of those not giving a clear positive response indicated that they were unsure how to interpret "meaningful", considered the relationship was already meaningful, thought the question inapplicable to their area, or felt it "depended on the person".

Most of those who considered that a more meaningful relationship should exist suggested ways of achieving this.

A number of responses (from nearly a quarter of those respondents who commented here) concerned the degree of involvement by lecturers in school experience and at school level in general. Calls were made for lecturers to become more involved in: observing student teachers during block practices, having closer and more constant contact with student teachers during practice sessions; joining supervising teachers in supervision; interacting individually with teachers, talking to school personnel; undertaking regular classroom experience (e.g. through regular secondment into teaching in schools or through their Professional Experience Programs) in order to become more attuned to real school life; and giving demonstration lessons, with pre- and post-lesson discussion. Some of the respondents making such suggestions recognised that these would necessitate more staff or less lecturing time for individual staff members.

Besides the calls for lecturers to work more closely with supervising teachers, there were several appeals for more interaction or a closer liaison between school and college staff. The terms "working partnership", "total co-operation", and "team work" were used in this context. Joint planning of the practice component, and joint responsibility (together with the student teacher) for the class were also mentioned as desirable developments.

Improvements to the campus component of the course, and to lectures in particular, were proposed by many of the lecturers. Making lectures more relevant, applicable or practically oriented, constantly relating content to the school situation, rejecting the college courses found to be less useful, and ensuring all lecturers integrated theory and practice were among the proposals here.

Concerning the amount of school experience in the program, it was suggested by a small number of lecturers drawn from three or four

programs that the time spent in schools be extended to enable student teachers to better assess the school situation, or that regular contact (once a week or fortnight) be combined with block practice, or further use be made of regular time in schools (e.g. to examine specific problems and situations). Rescheduling of the practice blocks, a block internship of half a semester or more, and a semester's "apprenticeship" to a teacher (designing units of work, observing, researching, proposing action) were each suggested by one lecturer. There were also a few suggestions concerning the use of school-based programs. Respondents in a university program called for creation of a viable school-based program; respondents in two college primary programs reported that more school-based subjects or more use of school-based experience in curriculum courses would be desirable; and several respondents in a college program with a significant school-based studies component felt that improvement of the school-based program would lead to a more meaningful relationship between school experience and tertiary studies.

Supervising teachers were the subject of a number of responses. Greater involvement of supervising teachers in campus-based courses was suggested by about a dozen respondents, drawn from about half the programs. Their suggestions included employing staff from teaching or administrative backgrounds as lecturers, appointing outstanding teachers as part-time lecturers, seconding teachers to the tertiary institution, and having more teachers work with student teachers in college lecture time. Besides being involved in a teaching capacity, it was also suggested that teachers be involved in a learning capacity; for example, "more teacher involvement in courses to update their knowledge in specific areas", "programs for teachers to create more flexible attitudes". Better selection ("handpicking") of supervising teachers was suggested by a couple of lecturers.

A more co-ordinated approach to the program was suggested by a small number of people whose specific suggestions included: a tighter, more deliberate integration among all aspects of the program (school experience, curriculum studies and teacher development), a reversion to "the old idea" of combining professional studies and teaching area studies, and giving an overall co-ordinating role to the lecturer in charge of teacher development.

Use of more effective college teaching/learning methods (e.g. seminars and discussions rather than merely lecturing) was recommended by a few lecturers.

The setting of assignments that directly related school experience and campus studies was a suggestion offered by two respondents in different programs.

A couple of lecturers mentioned involving students in lesson planning for particular content areas.

The topic of the relationship between school experience and campus studies was raised at the seminars held to discuss the results of the survey for each institution. There, it was seen as essential that a strong relationship existed between school experience and campus lectures. Several suggestions were made for achieving this. Most of these were mentioned in the questionnaire responses and are indicated above.

7.0 PARTICIPATION BY SCHOOL PERSONNEL AND LECTURERS IN ACTIVITIES DESIGNED TO PLAN AND CO-ORDINATE SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

An indication of the degree of co-operation and co-ordination between the teacher education institution and its practice schools can be gauged from a consideration of the extent of involvement by members of the various groups concerned in activities aimed at planning and co-ordinating the school experience program.

7.1 Participation by supervising teachers

7.1.1 Actual and desired participation

Table 37 shows the number and proportion of surveyed supervising teachers who were currently involved or had previously been involved in the activities listed. The table also shows the proportion of the group who wanted to be involved in each of the activities, whether or not they were currently participating or had done so previously.

Table 37: Supervising teachers' actual and desired participation in various activities

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=240)				SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=193)			
	Participating		Wanting to participate		Participating		Wanting to participate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. School-college/university advisory committees for planning school experience	16	7	92	38	12	6	74	38
2. Committees for planning teacher education program	9	4	76	32	11	6	71	37
3. Planning practice teaching handbooks	9	4	67	28	7	4	46	24
4. Designing evaluation schedules for school experience	8	3	94	39	5	3	67	35
5. Seminars or meetings for supervising teachers at college/university	70	29	145	60	30	16	103	53
6. Seminars or meetings for supervising teachers at school	102	43	163	68	59	31	126	65
7. Attendance at student teacher lectures at college/university	12	5	71	30	8	4	59	31

Apart from seminars or meetings arranged for supervising teachers at the school or at the college or university, supervising teacher involvement in the various activities was very low. In several programs, none of the teachers had participated in one or more of items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7. Participation in items 5 and 6 was a little higher for the primary programs than for the secondary.

A significant proportion of the teachers, however, said they would like to be involved in each of the activities. This was particularly so for items 5 and 6, seminars at the college or university and at the school, in which approximately half to two-thirds of the respondents indicated interest. The figure for item 6 was as high as 88 per cent in one primary program, and was often about the three-quarters mark.

7.1.2 Suggestions for increasing participation

Supervising teachers were asked what would be needed to allow them to increase their participation in the seven types of activities listed.

The most frequently mentioned factor was time. The need for more time was expressed in various ways, including "relieving teacher for the period involved", "departmental permission to leave school for the period involved", "release time from class", "more in-school time to be made available" and "lessening of school duties".

Calls for more consultation or communication with the teacher education institution or its lecturers, and for invitations to attend meetings or better information as to the opportunities for involvement were also common.

In a number of programs, teachers pointed out that the distance of their school from the tertiary institution largely prohibited their involvement.

The low proportion of teachers involved in the activities listed in Table 37 was a subject of discussion at the seminars held at the teacher education institutions in conjunction with this project. Suggestions made at the seminars for increasing participation included having a school experience committee for each school, having a school experience committee for each subject area of the secondary curriculum and improving the communication between teacher representatives on school experience committees and supervising teachers.

7.2 Participation by school co-ordinators

7.2.1 Actual and desired participation

The involvement of school co-ordinators of practice teaching in the various activities mentioned in the previous section is shown in Table 38.

Table 38: School co-ordinators' actual and desired participation in various activities

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=129)				SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=99)			
	Participating		Wanting to participate		Participating		Wanting to participate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. School-college/university advisory committees for planning school experience	44	34	67	52	20	20	52	53
2. Committees for planning teacher education program	22	17	60	46	11	11	54	55
3. Planning practice teaching handbooks	24	19	59	46	5	5	30	30
4. Designing evaluation schedules for school experience	29	22	62	48	15	15	42	42
5. Seminars or meetings for supervising teachers at college/university	66	51	87	67	51	52	62	63
6. Seminars or meetings for supervising teachers at school	73	57	95	74	52	53	77	78
7. Attendance at student teacher lectures at college/university	15	12	45	35	5	5	35	35

While there was considerable variation among the programs, school co-ordinator participation was, overall, proportionately higher than that of supervising teachers. The proportion of co-ordinators participating in certain activities was, however, still extremely small particularly as regards items 3 and 7 for secondary programs. As for supervising teachers, the activities with the greatest participation rate were items 5 and 6, seminars or meetings for supervising teachers at the college or university and at the school.

Again too, the proportion wishing to be involved was, for each item, higher than that currently or previously involved - considerably higher in most cases. Approximately 60 to 80 per cent wanted to attend supervising teacher seminars at the school or tertiary institutions.

7.2.2 Suggestions for increasing participation

Co-ordinators gave suggestions as to what would be needed to enable them to become more involved in these activities.

Easily the most frequently mentioned factor was time, including such comments as "release from teaching duties" and "lighter administrative load". Also widely noted was the need for an invitation to attend from the teacher education institution. A number of people again referred to their school's distance from the college or university.

7.3 Participation by lecturers

7.3.1 Actual and desired participation

The numbers of tertiary lecturers who had participated in the various planning and co-ordinating activities, and the number who wished to participate, are given in Table 39.

Table 39: College/university lecturers' actual and desired participation in various activities

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=102)				SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=82)			
	Participating		Wanting to participate		Participating		Wanting to participate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. School-college/university advisory committees for planning school experience	49	48	69	68	32	39	50	61
2. Planning practice teaching handbooks	47	46	63	62	29	35	42	51
3. Designing evaluation schedules for school experience	46	45	67	66	33	40	41	50
4. Seminars or meetings for supervising teachers at college/university	59	58	77	75	56	68	63	77
5. Seminars or meetings for supervising teachers at school	64	63	82	80	48	59	64	78

As one might expect, the level of lecturer participation in the listed activities was generally higher than that of school personnel, particularly supervising teachers. Participation in supervising teacher seminars at the college or university and at the school was not, however, much greater for lecturers than for school co-ordinators.

As was the case for school personnel, for all items the proportion of lecturers desiring involvement was greater than that currently or previously involved.

7.3.2 Suggestions for increasing participation

Among the college and university members of staff who responded concerning how their involvement could be increased, time was again the greatest problem. There were, for example, frequent calls for more time, more lecturing staff, a reduction in the diversity of lecturers' duties,

restructuring of programs so that there were no lectures to be given during a practice period, lighter teaching loads, reduced workloads, fewer students to supervise, and recognition of supervision as part of a lecturer's timetabled duties.

Several references were made to the decision-making structure in the institution, or to responsibility for the organisation of such activities. Some lecturers seemed to feel it was not their place to participate or that they would require an invitation to attend.

A number of lecturers felt there needed to be greater participation on the part of school staff to make such activities a success. These lecturers considered that this would necessitate changes in the attitudes of teachers and the State Department of Education toward teacher participation.

8.0 PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO SUPERVISING TEACHERS

8.1 Information about the school experience program

8.1.1 Sources of information

Supervising teachers and school co-ordinators reported on the sources whereby they obtained useful information about the school experience program. Table 40 summarises their responses.

Table 40: School personnel responses concerning sources of useful information about the school experience program

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS		SECONDARY PROGRAMS	
	N	%	N	%
(i) Supervising teacher responses	(N=240)		(N=193)	
. Practice teaching handbook	190	79	154	80
. College/university handbook	55	23	29	15
. Notes from college/university	68	28	29	15
. College/university lecturers	84	35	51	26
. Serving on college/university committees	6	2	4	2
. Student teachers	150	63	134	69
. School co-ordinator or principal	111	46	93	48
. School staff	72	30	40	21
(ii) School co-ordinator responses	(N=129)		(N=99)	
. Practice teaching handbook	109	85	94	95
. College/university handbook	62	48	33	33
. Notes from college/university	65	50	38	38
. College/university lecturers	94	73	64	65
. Serving on college/university committees	25	19	10	10
. Student teachers	67	52	53	54
. School staff	48	37	21	21

The table indicates that teachers and co-ordinators obtained useful information about the school experience program from a variety of sources, but mainly from the practice teaching handbook and from the student teachers. A large proportion of co-ordinators also reported that they obtained useful information from lecturers.

8.1.2 The practice teaching handbook

Teachers and co-ordinators also responded to an open-ended question which sought their comments on the usefulness of the practice teaching handbook in communicating information about the school experience program.

At the time this survey was undertaken, all except one of the programs had booklets (variously called handbooks, guides or manuals) conveying information about their school experience programs. The one exception used a photocopied section from the institution's overall handbook; this section will be treated as a practice teaching handbook for the purposes of the following discussion.

Of the eighteen handbooks provided, four were directed specifically at supervising teachers; these covered the practice components of two secondary programs at one college, the primary program at the same college, and the primary programs at two other colleges. Three handbooks were intended for both college and school supervisory staff, five for all those involved in the program, and four for student teachers only.

The following remarks apply to those handbooks not directed solely at students.

One college had two handbooks for the primary programs and two for the secondary program - one dealing with supervision requirements and one with administrative matters.

At two of the campuses which offered more than one primary or secondary program, the handbooks for all primary or all secondary programs were combined.

Most of the handbooks covered all years of the course. At one college, there was a separate handbook for each semester, while for another program, one handbook covered the first year of the course and a second handbook covered years two and three of the three-year program.

All the handbooks except two were on an A4 format, with paper covers. All but one had tables of contents. None were indexed. The length of the booklets varied from sixteen to 103 pages, but averaged thirty to forty pages.

The material contained in the handbooks varied considerably as to aspects of school experience covered, amount of detail provided and prescriptiveness.

Handbooks for all the programs gave some indication of the activities the student teacher was expected to undertake during the practice. At the minimum extreme were two cases where this consisted of one to three pages briefly outlining the requirements and procedures (e.g. regarding number of teaching and observation periods, suggestions for the students' progressive involvement with a class). At the other extreme were several handbooks containing lengthy discussions on the objectives of the practice in each semester or block practice, the amount and type of observation and of teaching to be undertaken, the importance of and requirements for lesson notes (e.g. number, type, format, with examples), guidelines for lesson preparation, and observation guidelines (e.g. scope, format for writing up).

Assessment of the student's practice teaching was discussed in all of the handbooks, and seven included facsimiles of the assessment instruments used. One included a self-evaluation checklist.

Ten of the fourteen handbooks contained descriptions of the roles or responsibilities of the various school and college or university supervisory personnel: school principal or co-ordinator of teaching practice, supervising/co-operating/associate teacher, specialist teachers in the school (in some cases), college or university co-ordinators of practice teaching, and other college or university personnel as appropriate to the particular program (liaison lecturer, visiting lecturer, adviser, assessor, moderator, curriculum studies lecturer, principal teaching subject lecturer, personal tutor). Some of the booklets mentioned the

role of, or gave the current membership of, various relevant committees (e.g. practice teaching committee, moderating committee). Most of the ten booklets mentioned here also listed the responsibilities of the student teacher (including, in some cases, a note on the legal status of student teachers). Two handbooks provided information only on the roles of the student and the supervising teacher.

Basic administrative information such as dates of block practices and lists of practice schools (and, sometimes, relevant personnel in those schools) were included in five of the handbooks.

Seven handbooks included a brief summary of the student's overall program.

Handbooks from two institutions included information on the progress rules for practice teaching, allocation of student teachers to supervising teachers, and payment of supervising teachers.

One of the booklets directed specifically at supervising teachers contained a section entitled "Some Background Resource Materials for Supervising Teachers"; this included subsections on the advantages of having student teachers, preparation before the student arrived, introducing the student to the class, and difficulties student teachers faced.

While there was some difference among programs as to the enthusiasm with which the handbooks were received, school personnel on the whole regarded the handbooks favourably, describing them as "helpful", "informative", "useful", "relevant", "clearly set out", and so on.

It was the case with most of the programs that a few people noted what they regarded as deficiencies in the handbook, or suggested improvements. Some of these deficiencies or needed improvements appeared to be peculiar to the particular handbook concerned, but some recurred from program to program. Examples of recurring comments are "too vague regarding expectations", "too much jargon", "needs better organisation", "too wordy", and "too theoretical". Positive comments nevertheless outweighed negative comments by a large majority.

A number of teachers and co-ordinators pointed out that they relied heavily on the handbook as it was sometimes their only source of information about the program, at least initially. Others remarked that personal interaction with lecturers would be preferable or was needed as a supplement.

In several programs, two or three respondents claimed not to have seen a handbook or to have received it only well into the practice, or complained of having to share a handbook with other teachers. One or two people admitted they did not have time to read the handbook.

8.2 Information about individual student teachers

8.2.1 Supervising teacher responses

Supervising teachers reported as to which kinds of information they received about individual student teachers. Their responses are indicated in Table 41.

Table 41: Supervising teacher responses concerning information provided to supervising teachers about individual student teachers

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=240)		SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=193)	
	N	%	N	%
1. Courses completed at college/ university	93	39	89	46
2. Previous school experience	100	42	38	20
3. Special abilities	56	23	16	8
4. Weaknesses	45	19	13	7

Except for the first type of information - courses completed in college or university - the proportions of teachers claiming to receive each type of information differed considerably between the primary and the secondary programs; in each case, the figure was higher for the primary supervising teachers.

The figures were, however, always below 50 per cent, and were particularly low (less than 10 per cent) for information about special abilities and weaknesses of secondary teacher education students.

For the secondary programs, information about courses completed at the college or university was the type most frequently received, while for the primary programs this type and that concerning students' previous school experience were received by roughly similar proportions of teachers.

The relative proportions of teachers receiving each type of information varied considerably from one program to another. The highest proportion recorded for any type of information was 83 per cent for courses completed at college or university, and the lowest was nil for special abilities and for weaknesses in one secondary program.

Supervising teachers were asked how such information about students was communicated to them.

Many teachers failed to respond to this question and others explicitly noted that information about individual teachers was not supplied to them.

The means and sources of communication indicated by the remainder varied considerably, both among and within programs. Since some of the means and sources mentioned are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and since the degree of explicitness of responses differed, it is difficult to judge how much similarity existed in the situations reported. A number of people mentioned more than one source or means of communication.

Commonly mentioned were letters, circulars, standard forms, and handbooks from the institution, sent either directly to the teacher or via the school administration. Many teachers said there was no formal means of conveying the information and that they only received it from the student teachers themselves once they had arrived at the school. Mentioned by some teachers was discussion with lecturers during their visits to the school. A few people referred to conversations with students' previous practice supervising teachers or to records of the students' previous practices.

While it seems that the predominant ways of conveying information varied to some extent from one program to another, and that some institutions or schools appeared to use more efficient or formalised ways than did others, it was clear that many teachers felt dissatisfied with

the amount of information they received.

When asked what information about individual students they would like to receive, supervising teachers answered mainly in terms of the types of information listed in Table 41.

For each of the four information types, approximately 40 to 50 per cent of the total number of teachers who responded in this survey indicated that they would like to receive such information. The figure was highest for special abilities. Included in these responses were calls for information as to: major and minor subjects in the student's course, precise topics covered in the course, and the student's academic record (counted under item 1); year levels previously taught, schools at which the student had undertaken previous practices, ratings received by the student for previous practices, subjects or units taught, number of weeks of practice so far undertaken, and stage of development reached (counted under item 2); and areas of specific expertise, particular skills in music, art, sports and so on, and special interests (counted under item 3). Those including special abilities and weaknesses indicated that this was so that the former could be utilised to advantage and help could be given to rectify the latter.

Special abilities and weaknesses were excluded by some respondents because they feared such information would prejudice their assessment of the student teacher, or because they wanted to judge these attributes for themselves, preferred the information to come from the student, or believed these attributes would become obvious soon enough.

A few teachers requested other information about the student, including age, personality, family commitments, and other work experience.

Provision of information about individual student teachers was a matter discussed at the school experience seminars. There it was noted that supervising teachers often had little information about students whom they were supervising. It was considered that some information would be useful to supervising teachers to help them to provide better guidance to students. It was suggested therefore that student teachers should forward a completed pro-forma to their supervising teacher listing their strengths, areas of special interest and college courses undertaken, and a summary of their practice teaching experiences so far. There was also a suggestion that the student provide the teacher with information on "weaknesses" or areas needing special attention. However, some participants in the seminars felt that information on weaknesses should not be given as this could lead to teacher prejudice when the student was being assessed.

8.2.2 Lecturer responses

Lecturers were asked to indicate the types of information about individual student teachers which they personally supplied to supervising teachers. Their responses appear in Table 42.

Table 42: University/college lecturer responses concerning information provided to supervising teachers about individual student teachers

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=102)		SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=82)	
	N	%	N	%
1. Courses completed at college/ university	43	42	46	56
2. Previous school experience	39	38	25	31
3. Special abilities	50	49	39	48
4. Weaknesses	42	41	38	46

The proportions of lecturers claiming to supply each type of information were fairly comparable for the primary and secondary programs, although the figure for the first type (courses completed at college or university) was a little higher for the secondary programs (56 per cent) than for the primary (42 per cent).

There was considerable variation among programs: for items 1 and 2, the proportion of lecturers ranged between nil and 67 per cent; for item 3, between 23 per cent and 100 per cent; and for item 4, between 15 per cent and 100 per cent.

Comparing Tables 41 and 42, there is clearly a discrepancy between the proportions of supervising teachers claiming to receive certain types of information and the proportions of lecturers claiming to supply it. This is most marked for information types 3 and 4 (special abilities and weaknesses) in the secondary programs; whereas nearly half the lecturers claimed to supply such information, fewer than 10 per cent of the teachers claimed to receive it. Some discrepancy was apparent in most of the individual programs although the particular information types concerned and the degree of disparity varied.

In a related question, lecturers were asked how the information was communicated to teachers. As with the responses of the supervising teachers to the same question, responses were mixed, and included reference to who communicated the information, in what form it was supplied, and when it was supplied.

Most of those who responded indicated that such information was conveyed verbally and informally, i.e. through discussion with supervising teachers (in most cases, during visits in the practice period).

A number of people qualified their responses by adding that the information was supplied only "when asked", "where appropriate", "at lecturer's discretion", "in confidence", "when teacher needs to know", or "after teachers have had time for own decision making".

Several respondents pointed out that they did not supply the information themselves, because it was not their responsibility or because they often did not previously know the students they supervised during practice teaching.

Written communication (e.g. copies of evaluation forms, official records, written outlines, course handbooks) was mentioned by some respondents, usually in reference to the first two information types. Some lecturers intimated that they themselves passed on written information, others that it was forwarded by the institution.

Lecturers were also required to comment concerning the types of information which they considered teachers should receive. Differing points of view were expressed.

At one extreme were a few lecturers who thought supervising teachers should be given no information at all, or as little as possible. At the other extreme were a much larger number who thought teachers should be given "as much information as possible", "any relevant information", or all four types of information listed in Table 42.

In between were the considerable numbers of respondents in each case who felt that a particular one of the four listed information types should be supplied. The number was greatest for type 1, courses completed at college or university, and smallest for type 4, weaknesses, although the difference in numbers between types was not great. Several lecturers mentioned the amount of content knowledge or level of performance to expect from the student under the first information type.

Qualifying comments recognising the student's right to privacy and dignity, and the dangers of setting up false expectations or of prejudicing the supervising teacher's view, were made frequently. A number of respondents felt that one or more of information types 2, 3 and 4 should specifically not be given, for these reasons. A few others considered that any such information should be given to the teacher by the student rather than by the lecturer.

Other information mentioned (apart from the four types listed in Table 42) included any outside difficulties or extenuating circumstances affecting the student, and the student's background or history.

9.0 ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS

9.1 Who makes the assessment

Student teachers, supervising teachers and lecturers were asked who actually made the assessment of student teachers' performances during their school experience. The responses of each group are shown in Table 43.

Table 43: Opinions concerning who was involved in making the assessment

		PRIMARY PROGRAMS		SECONDARY PROGRAMS	
		N	%	N	%
(i)	Lecturers' responses	(N=102)		(N=82)	
.	supervising teacher	101	99	80	98
.	school co-ordinator or principal	96	94	62	76
.	college/university lecturer	94	92	75	92
.	college/university co-ordinator of school experience	45	44	27	33
(ii)	Supervising teachers' responses	(N=240)		(N=193)	
.	supervising teacher	218	91	185	96
.	school co-ordirator or principal	126	53	69	36
.	college/university lecturer	124	52	80	42
.	college/university co-ordinator of school experience	25	10	17	9
(iii)	Students' responses	(N=240)		(N=203)	
.	supervising teacher	229	95	190	94
.	school co-ordinator or principal	128	53	61	30
.	college/university lecturer	180	75	146	72
.	college/university co-ordinator of school experience	45	19	21	10

From the table, it can be seen that virtually all respondents in each group reported that the supervising teacher was involved in assessing the student teacher. However, there were some discrepancies among the groups, and between the primary program responses and the secondary responses, concerning the involvement of the remaining persons listed. For example, while three-quarters of lecturers in secondary programs reported that the school principal or co-ordinator was involved, only about one-third of teachers and students thought so. The comparable responses for the primary programs were: nearly all lecturers reported involvement of the principal or co-ordinator, but only half the teachers and students reported this.

Figures concerning the involvement of the lecturer in assessment were very similar in both the secondary and primary programs but there were big differences in opinion among lecturers, teachers and students - nearly all lecturers, about three-quarters of students, but only half or 40 per cent of teachers reported involvement of the lecturer.

Concerning the college or university co-ordinator's involvement, there was some disparity between primary and secondary programs, and among groups (largely between lecturers on the one hand and teachers and students on the other).

The differences among the groups are not readily interpretable. One explanation is that some of those involved with the programs were misinformed about who made the assessment. Another is the fact that in several programs, some lecturers were involved in assessment while others were not.

It was remarked in the school experience seminars supplementing the questionnaire survey that students often did not have a sound appreciation of the methods used in their assessment, particularly the role played by the lecturer. The processes used in assessment and the roles of the various personnel involved therefore needed to be clearly explained to student teachers.

9.2 Role of school co-ordinator in assessment

School co-ordinators were asked whether they were involved in the assessment of student teachers, and if so, what their role was in this assessment.

Nearly all the co-ordinators said they were involved in assessment, and virtually all of these described their role.

A range of activities or functions was mentioned, but the typical co-ordinator's role in assessment seemed to involve observing the student teachers' lessons and in some cases their lesson preparation, observation notes or general involvement in the school, and discussing with the supervising teachers the assessment rating or grade to be awarded each student teacher. Also listed, in some cases additionally to discussion with supervising teachers, were (in order of frequency): compiling, co-ordinating, or moderating supervising teachers' opinions or reports; intervening or mediating in disputes among supervising teachers as to the rating to be given a particular student; and advising supervising teachers, especially those new to supervising or in doubt about the rating to give, as to assessment criteria and their application. A third component of the role was discussion or consultation with the lecturer. A number of co-ordinators also said they discussed the assessment with the student teachers.

In a few programs, some of the co-ordinators pointed out that their involvement in assessment was largely confined to cases where there was disagreement over the student's rating or where the student was considered in danger of failing the practice.

9.3 Provision of feedback on assessment

Questions about the feedback provided to student teachers on the assessment of their school experience performance were asked of student teachers, supervising teachers and lecturers.

9.3.1 Student teacher responses

Students' responses concerning the types of feedback they received are indicated in Table 44.

Table 44: Student teacher responses concerning types of feedback received on their performance

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=240)		SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=203)	
	N	%	N	%
1. Written comments by lecturer	171	71	133	66
2. Discussions with lecturer	176	73	147	72
3. Comments by college/university co-ordinator of school experience	38	16	28	14
4. Oral or written comments by supervising teacher	229	95	193	95
5. Comments by school principal or co-ordinator	110	46	41	20
6. No feedback usually provided	6	3	7	3

Virtually all the students reported receiving comments from their supervising teachers. Majorities also reported having discussions on their assessment with their lecturers and receiving written comments from their lecturers.

The proportions of students reporting each type of feedback were very similar in both the secondary and primary programs, except for the item "Comments by school principal or co-ordinator": whereas almost half the primary program students answered this item positively, only one-fifth of their secondary counterparts did so.

The degree of variation in responses among programs differed from item to item. The greatest variation was for items 1, 2 and 5: the proportions of students claiming to have received written feedback from the lecturer ranged between 13 per cent and 94 per cent; the proportions reporting that they received feedback in discussion with the lecturer ranged between 25 per cent and 94 per cent; and the proportions claiming to have received comments from the school principal or co-ordinator ranged between 9 per cent and 74 per cent. The item showing least variability across programs was item 4, comments by supervising teachers (ranging from 81 per cent to 100 per cent).

9.3.2 Supervising teacher responses

Table 45 presents supervising teachers' responses as to how they provided feedback to students on their assessment.

Table 45: Supervising teacher responses concerning ways in which they provided student teachers with feedback on their performance

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=240)		SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=193)	
	N	%	N	%
1. Written comments	197	82	157	81
2. Discussion with student teachers	230	96	185	96
3. Do not usually provide feedback	4	2	2	1

Almost all the teachers claimed to discuss their assessment with student teachers, and most also claimed to provide written comments. The average figures were almost identical for the primary and secondary programs, and were indeed very similar across all programs. However, two programs, both at the same institution, differed from the general picture. Concerning item 1, written comments, the figure ranged between 73 per cent and 100 per cent for all but these two programs, for which it was 45 per cent and 56 per cent.

9.3.3 Lecturer responses

Table 46 provides lecturers' responses concerning the means of supplying students with feedback on their performance.

Table 46: Lecturer responses concerning types of feedback provided to student teachers

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=102)		SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=82)	
	N	%	N	%
1. Written comments by lecturer	90	88	70	85
2. Discussions with lecturer	99	97	77	94
3. Comments by college/university co-ordinator of school experience	45	44	23	28
4. Comments by supervising teacher	100	98	78	95
5. Comments by school principal or co-ordinator	82	80	38	46

It can be seen that most or nearly all lecturers claimed that students were given both written and oral comments by their lecturers and comments by their supervising teachers. Their responses concerning comments by the school principal or co-ordinator differed greatly between the two types of programs: a large majority of primary program lecturers said students received feedback in this way, but under half the secondary lecturers said this. This difference reflects that in the students' responses to the same item.

These figures again showed some variation from program to program, especially for item 3 (nil for four programs, 8 per cent for one, 27 per cent for one, 32-39 per cent for three, 47 per cent for one, 56-57 per cent for two, and 63-67 per cent for two) and item 5 (between 25 and 100 per cent, with a spread similar to that for item 3). By contrast, figures for item 4, comments by supervising teachers, were very consistent (100 per cent for eleven of the programs, and 87 per cent, 95 per cent and 96 per cent for the other three) as were those for item 2 (approximately 90 per cent to 100 per cent for all programs except one, for which it was only 40 per cent).

Figures for item 1 also were reasonably consistent, varying only between about 70 per cent and 100 per cent for all but two programs (33 per cent and 40 per cent).

It is interesting to compare the lecturers' responses with those of the students. There was much greater variability and a greater range in the students' responses concerning items 1 and 2.

While the differences in lecturers' responses concerning item 3 would suggest that the role of the college or university co-ordinator in assessment varied considerably among programs, it would appear that this difference was less apparent to students (there being a smaller range, although still considerable variability, in their responses).

9.4 Comparability of rating standards among lecturers and among supervising teachers

9.4.1 Differences among lecturers

Student teachers responded to an open-ended question asking them to indicate the extent to which there were differences among the different lecturers who had supervised them in the standard expected for a particular rating or assessment during school experience.

Overall, slightly fewer than half the students who responded to this question thought differences among lecturers to be slight or non-existent. One or two students in each of about half the programs noted that they had had the same lecturer for each practice.

About a fifth of the responding students considered the differences among lecturers to be great or considerable, and another fifth had found "some" differences. The remaining students gave comments but did not indicate the extent of differences.

Respondents had found differences among lecturers as to the amount of lesson preparation required, the methods of presentation advocated, the degree to which the use of audio-visual materials was favoured, the aspects of teaching stressed, readiness to award the higher ratings, extent of criticism provided, and the degree to which the lecturer was prepared to "go along with" the school's opinions regarding the student teacher's performance.

Students claimed that differences accorded with lecturers' familiarity with contemporary schools, length of absence from teaching or amount of teaching experience (some were thought to be "out of touch"); lecturers' subject or teaching area (students thought lecturers marked "harder" when observing a lesson in their own teaching area); and the student's stage in the course (it was remarked by a few students that the standard required increased each year or semester).

Differences in responses from one program to another were evident: in a couple of programs a clear majority of students had found little difference among lecturers, in another few programs about half the students considered that there were major differences.

9.4.2 Differences among supervising teachers

Students were asked also to comment on the extent to which their various supervising teachers had differed as to the standard expected for a particular rating.

Taken as a whole, the responses indicate that just under half the students had experienced little or no difference among their supervising teachers in terms of standard required for a particular rating. The great majority of the remainder claimed there had been significant differences. Others pointed out differences but did not indicate whether they regarded them as minor or great.

Looking at individual programs, in only three was there a clear majority of respondents citing little or no difference. In another three, a clear majority considered there to have been considerable differences. In other programs the responses were more equivocal.

The main factors students found to be related to differences in rating standard among supervising teachers were: the teacher's preferred teaching style or student's ability to conform to this; the year or semester of the student teacher's course; the policy of the school regarding awarding of grades; whether the teacher marked students as students or compared them with experienced teachers; the teacher's age and experience; whether or not the student and teacher "got along" well with each other; the teacher's priorities or weighting given to the various assessment criteria; and the teaching area or subject concerned.

Students' views concerning differences in expectations between lecturers and teachers (rather than within each group) as to the standard required for a particular rating were indicated in Table 34 above (item 4).

9.5 Moderation of grades

9.5.1 School co-ordinator responses

Co-ordinators were asked whether, within their school, ratings awarded by different teachers were moderated to ensure comparability of standards among teachers.

In all except two programs, the majority of co-ordinators said that moderation occurred; the overall figure for all programs was about two-thirds.

Co-ordinators were then asked how this moderation was carried out, and nearly all those responding positively to the first part of the question replied.

Discussion among supervising teachers, or between teachers and others involved in assessment (particularly the school co-ordinator) was the means indicated by most of the co-ordinators whereby moderation was attempted. Some indicated that this discussion was informal, others that it took place in special meetings. Some also mentioned that the supervising lecturer was involved in such discussion.

Observation of all student teachers by the school co-ordinator or principal, in order to provide a basis for comparison, was mentioned by a number of respondents. Also noted, in some of the programs, were visits by supervising teachers to other classrooms to see students other than their own teach.

9.5.2 Supervising teacher responses

Supervising teachers were asked whether, within the school, ratings or assessments awarded by different teachers were moderated to ensure comparability of standards among teachers, and if so, how this was done.

About half the total number of teachers in the survey indicated that moderation occurred within the school. The figure varied somewhat among programs, reaching below 10 per cent in one case, being 20 per cent to 40 per cent in five cases, 40 per cent to 60 per cent in four, 60 per cent to 80 per cent in three, and reaching almost 90 per cent in another.

Nearly all those who said moderation was undertaken explained how this was done.

Respondents predominantly mentioned meetings of, or discussion among, the supervising teachers concerned. In some cases these meetings appeared to be held regularly, in others only at the end of the practice. Some people indicated that this discussion was informal. It was noted by a few respondents in most programs that members of the school administration (the principal, deputy principal, or co-ordinator) were involved in these discussions. In certain cases, involvement of the lecturer was also mentioned.

Respondents associated with one program referred to a formal moderation team or committee comprising the school administration, supervising teachers, visiting lecturer and college co-ordinator.

In about half the programs, mention was made of supervising teachers' observing students who were being supervised by other teachers.

A few respondents simply said that moderation was carried out by the principal, deputy principal or co-ordinator.

9.5.3 Lecturer responses

Lecturers' comments were sought on how they attempted to ensure comparability of assessment standards within and among schools.

Not all lecturers responded, some indicating that there were no formal means for doing this, or that they did not know how moderation was done, or that this was not their responsibility.

The most frequent and widespread means of moderation mentioned were: (i) discussions (preliminary and/or ongoing) with supervising teachers and to a lesser extent with other school staff (co-ordinators, principals) concerning assessment criteria, standards and levels of attainment (respondents in one program referred to the institution's holding of seminars on evaluation for supervising teachers); (ii) use of a standard assessment form or schedule, or of the same evaluation procedures, for all student teachers; and (iii) the supervising lecturer's viewing of students in a number of schools each practice period.

Several lecturers reported that they were able to rely on their own extensive experience, having observed many students over a number of years.

In three programs reference was made by most of the respondents to the use of a moderator or moderators, or a moderation panel or system for comparability across schools. In one case it was reported that the moderator was a member of college staff, and in another program the moderator was a local school principal.

A few respondents, drawn from four programs, mentioned discussion among college staff or with other lecturers involved in supervision. In one case this was described as occurring at the end of the practicum to consider all reports.

It was observed by respondents in some programs that moderation was made unnecessary, or was less of a problem, because assessment was only on a "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" or "pass/fail" basis.

9.6 Discussion of assessment criteria with student teachers prior to evaluation

9.6.1 Student teacher responses

Student teachers were asked whether they were given a copy of the evaluation schedule used in school experience before they were assessed.

About three-quarters of the total number of student teacher respondents reported that they had been given a copy of the evaluation schedule. While the proportion of positive replies was very high (almost

100 per cent in a couple of cases) in about eight programs, it was very low (29 to 39 per cent) in three programs (two of them at the same institution).

The students were also required to indicate the extent to which assessment criteria were discussed with them prior to their being evaluated. There was a variety of responses to this question. The extent of discussion indicated ranged from "none" to "great", but the amount of information given in responses varied considerably. Responses varied more within programs than across programs.

In half the programs, a majority of students replied that the criteria were discussed to only a little extent, rarely, or not at all. In another three programs, the proportion making such replies was only a little under 50 per cent, and in remaining programs it was never less than about 25 per cent. Most of the students appeared to find this situation inadequate. A few, however, felt that it was up to the students to seek more information if they wanted it, or that the explanations given in handouts or handbooks covered the criteria adequately.

Remaining students were less negative about the situation, although the actual amount of discussion which they implied took place may, in some cases at least, not have differed from that indicated by the students who were clearly dissatisfied with the amount of discussion.

Some described discussion as occurring but did not indicate whether they thought this satisfactory or otherwise.

While discussion (or the lack of it) at both the institution and the school were remarked upon, in only a few programs did a significant number of students report that discussion of the criteria occurred at the teacher education institution before the practice.

The responses of a few students from about half the programs presented a contrasting situation. These people reported that discussion had been fairly thorough or detailed.

Some of those indicating a satisfactory amount of discussion mentioned receiving an interim or progressive report on their performance, or regular discussion of their progress.

9.6.2 Supervising teacher responses

Teachers were asked to what extent they discussed with student teachers the criteria used in assessment.

While some teachers gave indications of the extent of discussion (e.g. "little" or "in detail"), others remarked on the timing or frequency of discussion or the form of that discussion. Some respondents combined these types of responses.

Generally speaking, most teachers felt that they discussed the criteria to at least an adequate or reasonable extent. A number went further and claimed to discuss these to a "great extent", "extensively", "in detail", and so on. Many teachers indicated that discussion of assessment criteria occurred regularly or frequently, through feedback after the student's lessons, or through daily or weekly discussion of progress. Some of these referred to the use of progressive evaluation sheets, lesson feedback checklists, and interim reports. Discussion early in the practice session or during the first contact with the student was mentioned by a few teachers. Another few mentioned that they asked student teachers to self-evaluate, some adding that this was used as a basis for discussion.

A significant number of supervising teachers, however, indicated that they discussed the criteria only "briefly", "to a limited extent", or not at all. The proportion of respondents reporting this varied considerably

from program to program (ranging from nil in one program to nearly half in another, but often about a fifth). Several of these teachers added that they thought the criteria seemed obvious from the report sheet, assumed the criteria had been explained to the students at the institution prior to the practice, or assumed the students were aware of the criteria.

9.6.3 Lecturer responses

All or almost all the responding lecturers in each program answered that their student teachers were given a copy of the evaluation instrument before they were assessed.

Regarding discussion of assessment criteria with the student teachers prior to their assessment, the variety of lecturers' responses was similar to that of the students' and teachers' responses.

Most of the lecturers reported that they discussed the criteria to some extent. One or two in most of the programs admitted that they gave the criteria little or no discussion. Some of these lecturers explained that they saw no need for discussion as the criteria were clearly stated in the handbook or on the evaluation schedule, or that there was little time or opportunity for such discussion.

A small number of respondents, drawn from half a dozen programs, indicated that such discussion was not their responsibility, but was done by the teaching process or practical studies lecturers, the college co-ordinator of teaching practice, the course co-ordinator, the practice supervisor, or the personal tutors. For one program, nine respondents or about one-third of the respondents in that program made this comment; for the other five programs, one or two lecturers in each case made such comments.

Many respondents mentioned some discussion occurring at the tertiary institution before the students went out to schools for their teaching practice. Cited in this respect were teacher development workshops, curriculum courses, pre-practice units, one-hour sessions with teaching process students prior to each practice, briefing sessions, meetings or group discussions, and distribution and discussion of the evaluation form.

Intermittent or regular discussion during the practice was noted by some lecturers, who mentioned giving students regular diagnostic feedback or discussing lessons they observed. Others referred to discussion during the practice period but indicated that this was done by the supervising teacher.

A few people indicated that the amount of discussion varied from student to student, saying that the criteria were discussed individually as necessary or on request.

9.7 The assessment criteria

The criteria used to assess final-year student teachers (as indicated on the various report forms and assessment sheets used) differed among institutions. Institutions with more than one teacher education course tended to use very similar, if not identical, forms for all the courses. The degree to which criteria were subdivided or explicated on the forms, the emphasis given to the various criteria, and the way they were grouped, varied considerably.

The forms for all the institutions included preparation or planning skills among their criteria. All also referred to implementation or teaching skills, including among these ability to motivate pupils, use of teaching aids, skill in explanation, skills in questioning, encouragement of pupil participation, use of voice, classrooom management and organisation, providing for individual differences, introducing and closing lessons, flexibility or variability of approach, reinforcement and pacing of presentation; in some cases, aspects

such as relationships with students, communication with pupils, teaching styles, communication skills and classroom management skills were listed as items additional to implementation.

The forms for two colleges, unlike the others, included no reference to assessment or evaluation of pupil learning.

Most forms also listed qualities such as manner, attitude to teaching, relationships with colleagues, initiative and capacity for professional development.

Comments were invited from student teachers, supervising teachers and lecturers on the criteria used to assess student teachers' school experience performance. Not all the comments made concerned the actual criteria, many referring to other aspects of assessment. All the types of comments, nevertheless, are reported below.

9.7.1 Student teacher responses

In each program, at least some of those who responded indicated that they were satisfied with, or favourably regarded, the assessment criteria; their comments were mostly brief (e.g. "good", "okay", "fair", and so on). As a proportion of the total student sample in each program, this group was as large as a half in one program but was well under 10 per cent in a few programs.

Favourable comments were outnumbered by unfavourable comments on the actual criteria in six of the programs. The major complaints were, firstly, that the criteria were too subjective or too open to the individual teacher's interpretation, thus reducing comparability of grades given among teachers (this complaint was made by up to seven students in each of nine programs), and, secondly, that the criteria over-emphasised certain attributes or aspects of performance, or failed to emphasise others (this was noted by one or two students in each of nine or ten programs). Aspects which students felt should be stressed to a greater extent varied from program to program, but included planning and classroom management skills; attitude towards children; attitude towards teaching; practice as opposed to theory; discipline; extra-curricular activities; actual teaching as opposed to planning; actual achievements in terms of class learning as opposed to manner and preparation; preparation, implementation and evaluation as opposed to dress and appearance; dress, manners and attitudes; teaching as opposed to artistic ability; and content knowledge.

Other problems with the criteria, each noted by a few students overall, were that the criteria were too numerous or detailed, and that some were unrealistic given the short duration of the practice or the fact that the students were very inexperienced at teaching.

Negative comments about other aspects of assessment were generally more frequent than those about the actual criteria. Inadequate discussion or explanation of criteria to students by both lecturers and teachers, and to both students and teachers by the college or university, was the most frequently mentioned problem. For example, students said: "There should be more explanation by college before practice as to how students would be assessed", "We should be told exactly what the lecturers and teachers will be looking for", "Needs to be more carefully explained to the supervising teachers".

Another widespread plea here was for the main say in the assessment of student teachers to be given to the supervising teachers since they had far more opportunity to observe the students than did the college or university supervisor. It seemed to the students unfair for lecturers to have "so much" influence on assessment when they saw only one or two lessons. This difficulty seemed to draw more comment in one particular program than in others (in most cases, one to three comments were made per program). This subject was raised at the seminars on school experience, where it was observed that students were often critical of

lecturers because they considered that lecturers had an influence on their assessment out of proportion to the amount of time which the lecturers spent observing each student teacher. It was considered, however, that the lecturers' main role in assessment should be one of negotiating grades and clarifying the criteria used in assessment. It was considered that their role in assessment should be clearly explained to student teachers.

A number of student respondents (one to four in each of five programs) commented on the rating system used. In one college where a five-point system was used, complaints were made that this system was too subjective and too restrictive, failing to allow for individual differences among students. It was suggested that written comments by the assessor be included on the assessment form. Overall, there was a range of opinions concerning the rating system: some students considered a seven-point scale should be used, others wanted a five-point scale, and still others considered a "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" rating was desirable. A grading system, rather than a "pass/fail" dichotomy, was supported by a majority of participants in the seminars.

It was considered by a few students that student teachers should be permitted to attend moderation meetings in order to provide some input into their own assessment.

Another few students in two or three programs felt that assessment was inadequately moderated across schools.

9.7.2 Supervising teacher responses

Favourable comments on the assessment criteria (usually in the form of a brief "reasonable", "satisfactory", "fair, "comprehensive" and so on) were made by fewer than 20 per cent of the teachers overall (fewer than half those who replied to this question). However, favourable comments outnumbered unfavourable ones on the actual criteria in about four programs.

Negative remarks about the criteria included the comments that some, at least, were: too vague, ambiguous or subjective; irrelevant, inappropriate, difficult to observe during the practice, too idealistic for beginners, difficult to assess, or inapplicable to certain areas or subjects; very detailed, or too complicated or involved. These criticisms were made by one or two people in most programs, the complaint about the subjective nature of the criteria being the most common.

A number of respondents were of the opinion that personal, written comments on the student's strengths and weaknesses would be more helpful or meaningful to both the supervising teacher and the student than were the present forms.

Teachers in a variety of programs felt that more emphasis should be placed on certain aspects of the student's performance; for example, potential rather than actual ability; control, presence and planning; voice (moderation, variety of expression); English usage, including grammar and vocabulary; presentation (dress, speech, personal habits); grooming, punctuality and co-operation; class control; and attitude to the work.

A few teachers pointed to the need for criteria to be kept under constant review.

Comments on aspects of assessment other than the criteria included calls for: more explanation by the college or university of the criteria or requirements for the practice; more notice to be taken of the supervising teacher's report as opposed to that of the lecturer or the school co-ordinator; and the use of a "pass/fail" or "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" system instead of ratings. Each of these calls came from five to ten teachers, drawn from five programs in each case. In addition, a couple of teachers thought supervising teachers

should have the opportunity to observe the lessons of a variety of student teachers to enable comparison with their own student.

9.7.3 Lecturer responses

Of the eighty lecturers who commented here, about forty-five indicated general satisfaction with the criteria used.

About sixteen (one or two in most programs) made negative comments on the criteria. Some indicated factors they considered should be included among the criteria (e.g. attitudes of students; development of knowledge, understanding and skills; attitudes towards planning), or factors they thought should be de-emphasised (e.g. expository skills; superficial behaviours and appearance). The criteria were also variously described as "nebulous", "too subjective", "too formal", "mechanistic", and reflective of an "outmoded and restricted view of the teacher's role". A couple of respondents thought the current criteria discouraged experimentation and innovation by student teachers.

The need for constant review of the criteria was noted by a few lecturers.

A couple of respondents in two different programs thought the criteria should be more related to those used by employing authorities in selecting teachers, or that there should be more input from employers.

A number of lecturers criticised aspects of assessment other than the criteria. Calls for a "pass/fail" system rather than grading were made by two respondents, and another suggested the use of diagnostic reports focusing on individual needs and development rather than grading.

10.0 OTHER ASPECTS OF SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

Towards the end of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to comment on a number of aspects of school experience which had not been covered in other questions. The questions on these aspects were drawn largely from issues raised by the various groups in preliminary interviews. Respondents' comments on these aspects are reported below.

10.1 Best aspects of school experience

All four groups of respondents were asked to state what they considered were the best aspects of school experience.

10.1.1 Student teacher responses

Almost all the students commented here, many giving more than one response.

The most common responses were references to the "reality" of the experience, to gaining practical experience in a real classroom, and, closely related to this, opportunity to put theory into practice, to try out ideas and experiment with various styles. These aspects were listed by about half the responding student teachers.

Another frequently mentioned factor was interaction with children or relationships with pupils; this was mentioned by large numbers of students in all programs (about 30 per cent of students).

Considerable numbers of respondents (about 20 per cent) in almost all programs listed factors such as interaction with other teachers, being helped by the supervising teacher, and opportunity to observe different teachers.

A further popular response (about 11 per cent of students) was the experience of continuous or block teaching, teaching continuous units

to one class, or planning and teaching an entire unit.

Other factors mentioned by numbers of students across several programs were: participation in school life, observing school functioning, and experience in different areas of the school; gaining insight into one's probable future profession before actually beginning it; experiencing a variety of classes and grade levels; having the class to oneself or being able to teach unsupervised; trying out discipline tactics or learning about discipline; collecting resources and lesson ideas, collating work programs; and preparing lessons, units and CCPs.

10.1.2 Supervising teacher responses

Besides being asked to comment on the best aspects of school experience, supervising teachers were required to list the positive and negative aspects of being a supervising teacher.

10.1.2.1 Best aspects of school experience

Again, practically all the teachers gave responses here, but many (nearly a quarter) answered from their own point of view as supervising teachers rather than, or as well as, giving aspects of benefit to student teachers.

In the former category, the aspect most commonly noted (by about 35 teachers from several programs) was the gaining of new ideas or fresh approaches, which, as one respondent put it, was "almost as good as an in-service program". Related aspects were also mentioned, including: exchange of ideas or professional interaction; the opportunity to renew basic teaching skills, being made to evaluate or think critically about one's own teaching, having to ensure that one's own teaching is "spot on"; keeping up with new developments and modern trends in teaching; and co-operative planning and teaching.

Often noted, too, was the assistance provided by students in the classroom or on fieldwork, and the extra time available to teachers to catch up on work or to plan ahead.

The satisfaction derived from assisting students or imparting one's own experience, or seeing students develop professionally was listed by about fifteen people from several programs.

A few teachers mentioned benefits to the pupils in their classes: the opportunity for them to relate to another adult and to experience different approaches or an alternative teaching environment.

The payment received for supervising was included by a few respondents.

Among responses referring to aspects of most benefit to the student teachers, the most frequent type of response referred to the "reality" of the experience, or the gaining of practical experience in the "real world" of the classroom. A second very frequently noted aspect was that of interaction with, or relating, to children or school students. Each of these two aspects was listed by large numbers of respondents in every program except one.

Factors mentioned by a number of people in most programs were: learning how a school works, or becoming used to school routine; putting into practice theory or ideas learnt at college, experimentation; the opportunity to work with, or observe, experienced teachers; and (a little less frequently mentioned than the others) the opportunity to discover if teaching was really the career the student wanted.

By far the most popular response, made by large numbers in each program (over half the total number of supervising teacher respondents), was that **supervising teachers gained, from their student teachers, fresh ideas or approaches that helped them in their own teaching.**

The second most frequent comment, made by about half as many teachers as that above, was that **being a supervising teacher led one to think more critically about one's own teaching style and effectiveness.**

Also mentioned very frequently, by teachers associated with most programs, were the following two aspects: **the satisfaction or sense of achievement to be gained from helping future teachers and from watching them improve; and the assistance provided by student teachers both in the classroom and with fieldwork and extra-curricular activities** - this enabled the supervising teacher to spend time on other activities (e.g. meetings, planning, "catching up") as well as enabling more individual attention to be given to pupils needing it, and facilitating group work.

Benefits to the supervising teacher's class were noted by numbers of respondents in nearly all programs. As well as points mentioned in the previous paragraph, teachers also commented that pupils were given the opportunity to relate to a different teacher, and to experience a variety of teaching methods and a diversity of adult models.

Small numbers of people noted the extra remuneration to be gained, and the opportunity for co-operative or team teaching.

10.1.2.3 Negative aspects of being a supervising teacher

Supervising teachers surveyed felt **the major negative aspect of supervising student teachers was the time-consuming nature of the task.** The extra time taken up in discussion (planning, co-ordinating, commenting on lesson preparation and on lessons given) with the student teacher, and the consequent reduction in the supervising teacher's own preparation and marking time, were noted by about one-third of all the responding teachers (large numbers in each program). Some also mentioned the added stress caused by supervising.

There were three factors each listed by about 20 per cent of respondents. The first two of these are closely related and overlap to some extent. They are, firstly, **the need for the supervising teacher to later review or reteach work in cases where it was taught inadequately by the student teacher,** or catch up on work not taught, and secondly, **the interruption to the work program and to class routine occasioned by having the student teacher.** The third factor was that **class discipline could suffer while the student teacher was present,** and that it took time for the class to settle down again and for the supervising teacher to re-establish rapport with the class after the student's visit. A few people added that some school students resented being taught by student teachers.

Problems with certain types of student teachers - those who lacked dedication, were overconfident, were unwilling to heed advice, were unwilling to put in the required effort, or were incompetent or lacking in basic content knowledge - were listed by about 10 per cent of respondents.

Other negative aspects recorded, by at least one teacher in each of two or more programs, were: difficulties associated with assessment (mainly the responsibility of having to grade student teachers, and the paper work involved); the loss of

regular teaching contact with some classes; the undesirable timing (e.g. at exam time) of the student's visit; and having an inadequate understanding of the teacher education institution's expectation for the practice.

10.1.2.4 Interviews with teachers who did not wish to supervise

In order to supplement questionnaire responses on this aspect of school experience, a small sample of teachers were interviewed informally regarding reasons why teachers may not wish to supervise student teachers. The teachers interviewed taught in primary schools in Toowoomba and in Brisbane. Most had formerly been supervising teachers but no longer wished to take on this role.

The reasons given by these teachers are summarised below, grouped as to the focus of the reasons. No claims are made for the representativeness of the views expressed.

Reasons focusing on the teachers themselves were as follows. Teachers who had taken students for a number of years may feel they needed a rest from the practice teaching program in order to sort out their thoughts and perspectives; they may feel it was time other teachers took a turn at having students. Those who had not taken students could be discouraged from doing so by hearing (e.g. in staff room discussions) of problems experienced by teachers who did take students. Teachers new to the school (i.e. in their first year there) may be considered by the principal to need time to settle in before taking a student. Teachers with personal problems (e.g. health) may feel disinclined to take on the extra responsibility of having a student. Some teachers felt threatened or embarrassed by having someone else in the classroom observing them, or asking to see their work programs or CCPs, especially if they did not use CCPs. One teacher did not want to supervise student teachers because of her own bad experience as a student teacher.

Certain types of classes were another reason for one objection to having a student teacher: teachers may feel that the particular class they had at the time would be unsuitable for a student teacher, either because the class was a particularly unruly one or because it was a composite of two year levels.

The following reasons focused on lecturers and the teacher education institution. While certain individual lecturers were acknowledged to be very helpful, others were considered to give teachers insufficient help - e.g. by not visiting the school frequently enough. The college often did not make clear either to supervising teachers or to student teachers just what it expected of them in the practice teaching program. In this regard, it was suggested that a meeting between lecturers and supervising teachers should occur at the beginning of the year to discuss the program and the tertiary institution's expectations. A particular example cited was the setting out of lesson plans: often students did not know how to set these out, and teachers felt unable to advise them as the method they had learnt may no longer be acceptable. It was thought the college should provide a definite method of setting out lesson plans.

A number of the reasons given arose from misgivings about the school experience program. It was remarked that student teachers were often overloaded with assignments they had to undertake while practice teaching; they often sat in the class doing their assignments when they should have been observing

the classroom teachers. Also, some teachers felt they themselves were required to alter their program to suit the college rather than the student teacher fitting in with the class teacher's program.

It was felt that practice teaching created false situations in that it was the class teacher who maintained discipline while the student teacher took a lesson. Student teachers were generally unable to cover the material at the same pace as was the class teacher, so the program had to be rearranged or work retaught.

Some teachers did not like the idea of having to make an assessment which could "make or break" the student teacher in the future; this should not be part of an ordinary class teacher's responsibility: teachers would rather just help students with their weak points.

Some teachers considered six weeks to be too long a time for block practice, especially if the student was poor or there was a "personality clash". In some programs or years, the timing of practice teaching blocks clashed with revision and testing periods in the schools; student teachers could not really teach anything at this time.

Student teachers were the cause of some teachers' reluctance to act as supervisors. Firstly, student teachers using class teachers' programs had been known to show these to lecturers who had then distributed them to other students; teachers considered that this was unfair use of material which they had spent much time and effort developing. Secondly, student teachers often had poor standards of spelling or grammar, and did not attempt to ensure their work was correct in these respects. Student teachers were considered to often lack content and knowledge of the curriculum for the particular year level.

10.1.3 School co-ordinator responses

School co-ordinators of practice teaching were asked what they regarded as the best aspects of school experience. Most of the co-ordinators responded. The great majority answered in terms of benefits to student teachers.

As with the supervising teachers, the most commonly cited aspect (about one-third of respondents) was the gaining of practical experience or actually teaching in a real classroom.

The next most frequent response concerned interaction with the other staff in the school: close contact with experienced teachers, both in the classroom (e.g. observing the variety of methods used by different teachers), and in the staffroom; the assistance given by the supervising teacher, particularly in discussions after lessons; and becoming part of a school staff.

The block nature of the practice, or continuous teaching of a block of work, was listed as the best aspect by a number of co-ordinators, though it was not mentioned by co-ordinators in all programs.

The opportunity to put theory into practice, and to try out ideas in a "sheltered environment", was listed by several respondents, as were gaining a full understanding of the nature of the profession, and full participation in school life, e.g. in extra-curricular activities.

The following were each recorded by one or two people in at least two programs: learning how a school functions on a day-to-day basis, improvement of teaching skills, development of a teaching style,

learning classroom control, and realising the need to learn the content of what one was teaching.

A number of co-ordinators answered from their own point of view as co-ordinator as well as, or instead of, from the student point of view.

The main factor they mentioned was that new ideas and enthusiasm were brought into the school, and that teachers learnt from their students or were led to reassess their own techniques.

The development of co-operation between schools and teacher education institutions; the chance for discussion with college or university personnel; and the development of working relationships with young, enthusiastic teachers were other aspects listed.

10.1.4 Lecturer responses

Most of the lecturers commented concerning the best aspects of school experience, and the majority responded from the student standpoint.

Here once again the most common response was "the gaining of practical experience", "experience in a real classroom", or "realism". This was noted by about a quarter of responding lecturers.

The opportunity to apply the theory learnt in college, to see how theory and practice were related, and to try out ideas; interaction with children or school students; and interaction with other teachers, including observing their qualities, seeing the different methods used by teachers in various situations, holding discussions with other teachers, and gaining assistance from supervising teachers were each listed by about 20 per cent of respondents.

Small numbers of lecturers, drawn from fewer than half the programs, included as best aspects: the development of essential skills and of a teaching style; taking part in school routine, gaining knowledge of school organisation, full participation in school life (e.g. in extra-curricular activities); finding out if one was really suited to teaching; class teaching for a complete segment of work, planning and implementing a sequence of lessons; and the facilitation of professional socialisation.

A number of lecturers answered from what might be regarded as their own position rather than that of the student teacher. The aspect most frequently mentioned for these respondents was that involvement in school experience kept them in contact with what was happening in schools; this allowed their views to be more practical and their expectations more realistic. As well as this, "dialogue with school colleagues" or "working with the class teacher on an equal basis", and "working with school children again" or "keeping in touch with teaching children" were mentioned.

Aspects such as assisting students, close interaction with the students one was supervising, and seeing students develop skills were also listed.

The opportunity for interaction and the development of better relationships between schools and teacher education institutions were listed by a few lecturers.

10.2 Allocation of student teachers to supervising teachers

Student teachers, school co-ordinators, supervising teachers and lecturers answered an open-ended question asking them to comment on the way in which student teachers were allocated to schools and to supervising teachers.

10.2.1 Student teacher responses

Overall, about three-quarters of all student respondents answered this question.

In four programs, the number of students indicating general satisfaction with allocation was about the same as that indicating dissatisfaction. In seven programs more were dissatisfied than were satisfied, and in the remaining three, those satisfied outnumbered those dissatisfied. Those indicating satisfaction usually did not elaborate on their response. The discussion below is therefore concerned with those student teachers who were not satisfied with their allocation to supervising teachers.

The major reason for dissatisfaction with allocation, a factor mentioned by nearly one-sixth of those who answered this question concerned **supervising teachers. Students complained that some supervising teachers were unsuitable as supervisors** because they were unwilling to be supervisors and therefore put little effort into the task, were incompetent or inexperienced teachers, were lax or uninnovative, or only took on the task for the extra help and money it brought. **Some of these students** made a plea for **supervising teachers to be more carefully selected.** A further number of students referred to the potential for clashes of personality or teaching ideology between student teacher and supervising teacher. These students thought that student teachers should be permitted to change to another supervising teacher if this occurred, or suggested that students and supervising teachers meet before the practice, with students able to decline to work with the teacher if there seemed to be a problem, or that a one- or two-week trial period be undergone.

The other major problem with allocation (mentioned by about one-tenth of those responding to the question, and in seven programs only) concerned the location of the practice school. Complaints were made that students were allocated to schools at great distances from their place of residence, necessitating much expense and wasted time spent in travelling, particularly for those without private transport.

Students in six programs referred to the need for experience in a variety of year levels. They felt that, in each practice, students should either be given a year level they had not yet taught, or should be asked which year level they would prefer. Numbers of students (one or two in most programs) also mentioned the need for variety of teaching situations (e.g. conventional and open-space classrooms, composite classes, team teaching) or of school types ("disadvantaged", "upper class", government, private). The subject of the variety of settings for school experience was discussed in a previous section of this report (see section 4.0 above).

Many other students made more general complaints such as that their indicated preferences had not been heeded, that they were given insufficient choice, or that allocation appeared to be a very haphazard affair.

10.2.2 School co-ordinator responses

Co-ordinators were asked about the methods used to allocate student teachers to supervising teachers. Although virtually all the co-ordinators responded, many actually reported the basis on which teachers were selected to become supervisors, rather than the means of allocation. Both teacher and student teacher characteristics were mentioned as bases for allocation by those who did report on this.

There were apparently three main bases on which teachers were selected as supervising teachers. **These were firstly, the teacher's willingness to have a student teacher** (mentioned by half the co-ordinators); **secondly, the teacher's amount of teaching experience** (mentioned by just under half the co-ordinators, several of whom indicated that teachers needed at least five years', or at the very least two or three years', experience); **and thirdly, the teacher's teaching ability, competence or expertise** (mentioned by nearly 40 per cent of co-ordinators). These three factors were listed by respondents in all or nearly all programs.

The teacher's personality, or ability to work well with or helpfulness

towards student teachers were also listed frequently by questionnaire respondents.

Twenty per cent of co-ordinators indicated some attempt was made to match students and teachers on the basis of year levels taught - the aim being to give students experience at a variety of year levels. Fifteen per cent of co-ordinators, all of whom were associated with secondary programs, reported that matching was undertaken on the basis of teaching subjects.

A variety of other factors (e.g. number of students taken by the supervisor, timetabling contingencies, and teaching style) were each listed by a few people.

The careful selection of teachers to supervise students during school experience was seen by participants in the school experience seminars as crucial to the success of the school experience program. It was thought that a prime consideration in the selection of supervising teachers should be their willingness to undertake supervisory duties: teachers should not be coerced into taking students. The school principal or co-ordinator had a key role in selecting supervising teachers. It was considered important, then, that the criteria for effective supervision should be identified and that those selecting supervising teachers were aware of these criteria.

10.2.3 Supervising teacher responses

Only about half the supervising teacher sample commented on the allocation of students to supervising teachers, and several of those who replied merely stated how allocation was carried out (e.g. "it is the principal's decision") or said they did not know how this was done or that there seemed to be no particular system, or gave fairly neutral responses such as that they thought the authorities did their best under the circumstances. About 40 per cent of those who commented indicated explicit satisfaction with the system. Therefore, while there was no indication of widespread dissatisfaction with allocation, there were nonetheless a number of comments of a critical nature.

Among the complaints and suggestions made, there was comparatively little commonality. None of the factors discussed below was mentioned by teachers in all programs.

One theme which did recur was that teachers would like to be given more choice as to whether or not they would take a student, rather than just being told or being expected to have a student every time.

Some form of screening of teachers willing to be supervisors was mentioned as desirable by a number of teachers. Criteria of selection indicated were teaching competence, supervisory ability, and competence in classroom management. Selection by a panel (including the principal), by the principal, by the co-ordinator, by the college, and by a Department liaison officer were all suggested.

Personality factors were noted by a small number of respondents, who thought some attempt to match the student and the teacher on a personality basis should be made, or that if a clash occurred the student should be reallocated.

The subject of numbers of teachers per student and vice versa was raised by teachers in several programs. It was felt that supervising teachers should have only one student at a time, but that it was of benefit to students for them to have more than one supervising teacher. On the other hand, at the seminars associated with this project, it was suggested that to help ease considerably the shortage or potential shortage of supervising teachers, two student teachers be placed under the supervision of one teacher. This would have the additional benefit of allowing opportunities for student teachers to

observe each other's teaching and to provide each other with evaluative feedback.

The desirability of students experiencing a variety of year levels, or being given their preferred year level, was referred to several times in the questionnaire responses.

Earlier notification of the students' impending arrival, or of the students' subject areas or preferences, was seen as desirable.

10.2.4 Lecturer responses

The response rate overall for this question among lecturers was about 65 per cent. Of those who responded, some commented favourably on allocation, some stated how students were allocated, and some gave neutral responses (e.g. "varies from school to school", or "always difficult").

The great majority (three-quarters), however, registered dissatisfaction with the way students were allocated to supervising teachers or else suggested changes to the allocation system.

Practically all of these responses concerned the suitability of some teachers to act as supervisors. Negative comments of varying strength about supervising teachers were frequent (e.g. "many should not be teachers let alone acting as supervisors", "some supervising teachers lack commitment to the role", "supervising teachers are not always helpful"). More often, the problem was phrased in terms of the need to more carefully select supervising teachers to ensure that only "qualified", "willing", "successful", "up-to-date", "competent", "conscientious", "dedicated", "creative", "innovative" or "efficient" teachers were chosen. Enhancing the status of the role, or allowing teachers to alternate (year on, year off) were suggested as means of encouraging the "best" teachers to become involved. A number of lecturers called for the teacher education institution or lecturers to have more say as to which teachers would supervise their students.

It was recognised, though, that the problem of "unsuitable" supervising teachers was largely brought about by the lack of sufficient experienced teachers relative to the large numbers of students who had to be accommodated.

As already mentioned, the subject of selection and preparation of supervising teachers was discussed at the school experience seminars. At the seminars, it was again acknowledged that it was becoming more difficult to attract teachers to supervision, and that the problem was exacerbated by the increased numbers of pre-service teacher education students. Ways needed to be found, therefore, of encouraging more teachers to undertake supervision, and of maintaining the interest and enthusiasm of those teachers who were presently supervising student teachers. Various incentives were mentioned (see section 10.6 below).

It was thought, too, that staff of the tertiary institution could play a significant part in helping to engender a sense of commitment amongst teachers to the school experience program. Lecturers who were enthusiastic themselves and who were prepared to spend time in the schools talking to teachers or in helping to organise seminars for current or prospective supervising teachers tended to engender a similar enthusiasm in teachers.

The potential for incompatibility of personalities and teaching styles was mentioned by a few respondents. Suggestions for avoiding or overcoming this were: discussion between school and institution personnel, early appointment of students to school to allow them time to get to know the staff, a meeting of students and teachers before the practice to enable mutual selection to occur, intervention by the co-ordinator if problems arose, and the allocation of each student to two or more teachers simultaneously.

10.3 Reasons for teachers becoming supervising teachers

It was considered that it was important to examine the reasons why teachers take on the task of supervising student teachers. Supervising teachers were therefore asked why they became supervisors.

Almost all the teachers responding to the questionnaire made a response to this question.

About 40 per cent of respondents gave as a reason the fact that they were asked or approached by the school principal or administration or less frequently the teacher education institution, or were given no option or just told they were to take a student. Some of these teachers gave reasons why they were asked or expected to have students; e.g. they taught the required subjects, had sufficient teaching experience, or were in a practice school. A couple mentioned being threatened with transfers if they did not comply. For most of the teachers giving such reasons for their becoming supervisors, this was only one of the reasons, or was only the initial reason.

Another set of reasons commonly given (by nearly a quarter of those responding) was that involving a desire to help student teachers, to share one's expertise, ideas, skills, or ability, or pass on knowledge and experience; a feeling of having "something to offer" or a belief that one's experience would be beneficial to student teachers.

Many people (approximately 20 per cent) mentioned feeling a professional responsibility to assist future teachers or an obligation or desire to "repay" the assistance they themselves received as student teachers.

Apart from such altruistic reasons, quite a number of people referred to the recognition that supervising students could be of benefit to themselves. By far the major factor here was the chance to gain fresh ideas and stimulation for one's own teaching. Also mentioned were the financial incentive, the motivation provided to critically assess or re-evaluate one's own teaching, the provision of variety for the pupils in the teacher's classes, the assistance provided by the student in the classroom, enjoyment of the company of young teachers-to-be, and the opportunity to maintain contact with teacher education or teacher education institutions.

Small numbers of teachers mentioned shortages of supervising teachers in their subject areas or with the appropriate year levels as a reason for their becoming supervisors.

10.4 Time in the year when block practice scheduled

Student teachers, their supervising teachers and their lecturers were asked to comment regarding the timing of block teaching practices.

The number and timing of blocks in the final year varied from program to program: Table 20 (above) sets out the duration of the block practices for each program and the semester in which they were held. Almost every month of the school year was used overall, although only one program had a practice at the beginning of the year. The period March to September was the most popular. The year in which the survey was undertaken, 1982, was atypical in that some programs had their usual practice teaching times disrupted by the holding of the Commonwealth Games in Brisbane.

10.4.1 Student teacher responses

Responses to the question were received from most students in each program giving an overall response rate of 85 per cent.

The proportion of students in each program commenting favourably on the timing varied between zero and 66 per cent, although in seven cases it was between 20 per cent and 35 per cent, was in only two cases 50 per cent or over, and averaged 33 per cent.

By far the major complaint of students dissatisfied with the timing was that the

practice period occurred during the school examination period or the revision period immediately prior to it. This meant that students' actual teaching time was greatly reduced, the teaching was mostly revision rather than teaching of new content, the teachers were nervous or busy writing reports, and the pupils were tired. Such problems with practices occurring during exams or at the end of a semester were mentioned by students in all programs except two. However, the proportions of students in a program who mentioned the problem of examinations varied considerably among programs. Of the two programs in which no complaint was made about clashes with school exam times, one had block practices early in semester one only, and the other had practices in May and in August-September. Ten per cent or less of the students in a further three programs referred to problems with school examinations. One of these programs had a practice in the middle of each semester, and two had their practices at the beginning of semester two. In six programs, between 30 and 60 per cent of students were concerned with the effects of school examinations on their school experience. Three of these programs had block practices in October or near the end of each semester; others, however, had practices at much the same time as those in which clashes with school exams seemed to be much less of a problem.

Complaints about clashes with exam times in schools were made in all secondary programs, where they were made by between 5 and 48 per cent of respondents in each program (average 33 per cent), and in six of the eight primary programs, where they were made by between 4 and 30 per cent of the respondents in those programs (average 19 per cent). It would appear then that this problem was less severe for primary student teachers than for secondary student teachers.

A couple of students in each of the two programs with practices at the beginning of semester two felt this time was inappropriate as schools tended to be a little disorganised, pupils took time to settle down after the holidays, and the students did not see any assessment being undertaken.

A small number of respondents, drawn from seven of the programs, referred to a clash with their college examinations or assignments. This was a considerable problem in one particular program (mentioned by half the responding students in the program); in this program the practice occurred just before the institution's examinations and students felt this placed too much stress on them. In another program, the practice was immediately after the college's exams and some of the students felt they needed a break before going out to practice teaching.

Two or three students in each of five programs referred to their practices being interrupted by various school activities. The following were mentioned: musicals, sports days, eisteddfods, fetes, career talks, work experience programs, moderation meetings and ASAT tests, school holidays (mid-year), or public holidays.

A few students from five programs indicated a desire for some practice teaching experience to be gained during the first weeks of the year so that they could see how the teacher handled a new class or how initial content in the subject was taught. However, about a third of the respondents in the only program which did have a practice at the beginning of the school year considered this timing inappropriate; they claimed they did not know what was expected of them.

Students in three programs complained of the blocks occurring at the same time in both the second and third years of the program, so that students saw the same material being taught both times.

Other timing problems, such as a lack of a break for students before and after the practice, most of the year's practice teaching being over before half the theory had been covered, and the second practice being

too soon after the first, were restricted to single programs or institutions.

Some of the students responding mentioned factors other than the time of the year at which the practice occurred. For example, a few in each case called for longer blocks, shorter blocks, and regular visits as well as block practice.

10.4.2 Supervising teacher responses

Roughly 70 per cent of the supervising teachers commented in response to this question. Of these, about 30 per cent said they found the timing satisfactory, and some merely indicated the time at which the practice was held, or commented that any time was suitable or that any time was difficult.

As with the student teachers, easily the most common complaint or plea (made by about a third of the teachers who commented) concerned the holding of teaching practices prior to or during school examination periods, or at the end of a quarter or semester. The reasons given for the desirability of avoiding this time were similar to those given by students - the teaching at this time was atypical, little actual teaching experience was gained by students, teachers were busy finalising their own evaluation and writing reports, and pupils lacked enthusiasm or were restless because of the approaching holidays. Teachers in all programs, except the one in which the block practice occurred early in the first semester, referred to this problem.

A number of teachers, albeit only a third as many as mentioned the unsuitability of the end of semester, referred to the beginning of the school year or of a semester as inappropriate times for the practice. Teachers mentioning this were involved in eight of the programs. They gave as reasons that this time was often a little chaotic, that pupils took time to settle in, or that starting new work required as few interruptions as possible. A few teachers also felt that holding practices at such times meant that too long a period elapsed before students took up their teaching positions.

However, a small number of teachers from five programs recommended having practices at the beginning of semester or early in a semester. This was so that students could teach new work or see new work being taught, and so that the teacher could later rectify any problems caused by the student's visit or make up for time lost.

There were calls from teachers in two programs which each had one six-week block in the third year, for the block to be broken into smaller segments taken at different times of the year.

10.4.3 Lecturer responses

Sixty-four per cent of lecturers replied concerning the timing of school experience. Of these, about a third felt the current timing to be generally satisfactory, about 15 per cent observed only that there were problems with any time of the year, or that timing was irrelevant, and a small percentage merely stated the time at which the practice occurred.

The remainder (just under a half of those who responded) noted a wide variety of problems or suggestions.

One of the few areas about which more than one or two people commented, or which was not restricted to one program, was that of school exam times. About 10 per cent of those who commented mentioned the desirability of avoiding these periods.

A few people, drawn from four programs, spoke against holding practices at the beginning of semester.

That the timing of the practice disrupted the on-campus component of the college program was noted by a few respondents (two programs).

At the school experience seminars, it was felt that school experience should be held at a variety of times in the year, and that the timing of the practice should be dependent on its objectives.

10.5 Use of schools' resources by student teachers

Student teachers were asked about the use they were able to make of schools' resources.

About 70 per cent of the students responded. Just over half indicated satisfaction with this aspect of their school experience, saying that they were usually given full use of resources, that resources were readily available or that schools had been very helpful.

In all programs there were some students who were dissatisfied with their experiences regarding schools' resources.

Many of these considered that student teachers should be informed of the resources available upon their arrival at the school. Suggestions in this area included showing the students the location of resources, and informing them when they were available and how to gain access to borrow them, giving the students a list of the resources available, and arranging talks, demonstrations, tours, and a meeting with the school librarian and resource officer.

Several respondents claimed that their use of equipment and materials was restricted, e.g. several said they were permitted to use only non-consumables and had to pay for their own paper, cardboard and stencils or were discouraged from using much of these items; others stated that an OHP was available only in the library, that their lesson preparation was affected by cutbacks in photocopying, and that only limited use of the library was permitted. Some students felt upset about this, saying that some schools were "miserly", made students feel "like thieves" or allocated them fewer resources because they were students; respondents thought that students should be entitled to the same resources as their supervising teachers.

A number of respondents pointed out that some schools did not have much in the way of resources or said they recognised that financial constraints operated. A few suggested that schools be given extra money to cover student teachers' use of consumable items.

A small number of students observed that they could usually find better resources in their college libraries.

10.6 The industrial agreement governing practice teaching in state schools

A series of questions was put to school personnel on the industrial agreement concerning the supervision of student teachers. The agreement, which sets out rates of payment, aspects of the role of supervising teacher, activities to be undertaken by student teachers, and so on, is negotiated annually by the Queensland Education Department, the Queensland Teachers Union and the Joint Training Institutions.

There was no general desire among either teachers or co-ordinators for changes to be made to the industrial agreement. When asked whether they thought changes should be made, most teachers and co-ordinators either did not respond, or circled "no" or "does not apply".

Teachers and co-ordinators involved in the McAuley College program are excluded from the following analysis since, being in private schools, they were not subject to the industrial agreement and were not paid for their roles in relation to school experience.

Only 12 per cent of each of the two groups of school personnel (73 people in all) considered there was a need for changes. Most of these commented as to what changes they saw as desirable.

Of the fifty-six teachers and co-ordinators who commented, more than a quarter thought the payment should be increased to adequately reflect the amount of work involved. Another proportion (making nearly a third when combined with the previous point) thought the allowance should be based on a more realistic assessment of the actual time involved in supervision, including discussions out of class time, rather than there being a maximum weekly allowance based on a number of hours which was exceeded by most supervising teachers.

A few people in each case suggested the following: prompt payment, finalisation of the agreement before the commencement of the practice, and payment to be made tax-free. A variety of individual suggestions was also made.

The supervising teachers (including those involved with the McAuley College program) were also asked how important it was that they be paid for supervising student teachers. Their responses are given in Table 47 below.

Table 47: Supervising teacher opinion concerning the importance of payment for supervising student teachers

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=240)		SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=193)	
	N	%	N	%
Very important	68	28	50	26
Moderately important	77	32	65	34
Slightly important	49	21	33	17
Not important	45	19	42	22

Responses were very similar in both primary and secondary programs. A small majority of teachers (60 per cent) thought payment to be very important or moderately important. Although more than a quarter of respondents considered payment very important, nearly as many (about one-fifth) thought it not important.

The responses of teachers associated with the McAuley College program differed from those of the other teachers. Only 23 per cent of McAuley teachers answered in the first two categories, and over half (55 per cent) thought payment unimportant.

It is significant to note in this regard that only a quarter of school co-ordinators overall thought they would be able to recruit sufficient supervising teachers if there was no payment for supervision.

Table 48 below shows, however, that teachers would be prepared to consider incentives other than payment to supervise student teachers. The response pattern differed somewhat between primary school and secondary school teachers. Among the former, the proportions (26-28 per cent) of teachers looking upon a reduced teaching load and credit towards further study as desirable incentives were about the same as that looking upon payment in this light. Among secondary teachers, however, a reduced teaching load was a more attractive incentive than was payment, and credit towards further study appeared less attractive.

Table 48: Supervising teacher opinion concerning the most attractive incentive to supervising student teachers

	PRIMARY PROGRAMS (N=240)		SECONDARY PROGRAMS (N=193)	
	N	%	N	%
Reduced teaching load	62	26	81	42
Payment	64	27	62	32
Credit towards further study	66	28	34	18
Improved career prospects	45	19	27	14
Nothing	23	10	12	6

(Note: Some respondents gave more than one response)

At the seminars held as part of the school experience project, the question of recognition of the role of supervising teacher was raised. While payment was one form of recognition, it was thought that other incentives could be examined. These included providing supervising teachers with some relief from their teaching duties, having "supervising teacher" as a career step which would earn extra remuneration, and providing supervising teachers with credit towards an education degree. It was suggested that tertiary institutions might consider giving official recognition to supervising teachers by appointing them as "teacher education associates" or "temporary lecturers" or by accrediting supervising teachers or establishing a register of teachers suitable to be supervisors. More use could also be made of supervising teachers as guest lecturers at tertiary institutions.

10.7 Areas in which school personnel would like more assistance

Supervising teachers and school co-ordinators were asked to indicate areas in which they would like more assistance from the teacher education institution in their roles in school experience.

10.7.1 Supervising teacher responses

About two-thirds of the teachers responded, but a small number of these (about 8 per cent) said that there were no areas in which they required further assistance and that they were satisfied with the present situation. A few people said that any assistance would be welcome.

There were four main areas in which teachers wanted more assistance.

First among these (mentioned by respondents in all programs and overall by more than a quarter of those who responded to the question) was the area of the teacher education institution's expectations regarding the practice. **Teachers wanted a clearer idea of what the institution expected of both the student teacher and the supervising teacher during school experience.** Specifically, teachers reported that they wanted information on what was expected of students at each year level; what was required regarding lesson preparation, comments on lessons, and observation lessons; how the institution expected assessment to be made, what was meant by the criteria wording; and so on. A number of these teachers suggested that the college or university hold seminars or meetings or even a full induction program for supervising teachers in school time.

The second major area (20 per cent of respondents, all programs) **was that of background information about the student teacher.** Teachers requested that a profile of the student be available prior to the practice so that they could plan accordingly. The types of information called for included teaching subjects, past practice performance, other practice

schools, strengths and weaknesses. (See also section 8.2 above.)

More contact with lecturers was the third main area which teachers mentioned (about 20 per cent of those who commented, all programs except two). Respondents called for more frequent visits by lecturers to the schools to observe students and to discuss with supervising teachers the students' work; discussion before, or early in, the practice period, with a lecturer who knew the student; greater availability of lecturers to answer telephone queries; and more consultation about practice times and programs.

The fourth commonly-listed area (10 per cent of those responding, nine programs) **was that of the teacher's knowledge about the college component of the student's course.** Teachers wanted more knowledge of college courses in order to better understand students' prior learning (e.g. a summary of subjects covered, copies of notes on subject matter); more idea of what methodology the student had covered in theory; which curriculum areas had been covered; which formats had been shown for the writing of CCPs; and so on. (See also section 8.1 above.)

In addition to these four main areas, small numbers of teachers requested each of the following: demonstration lessons taken by lecturers, a better knowledge by students of the school curriculum, more subject knowledge by students, and more emphasis on subject methodology in the tertiary course.

10.7.2 School co-ordinator responses

The question was answered by about 60 per cent of the school co-ordinators; however, more than one-fifth of those who answered said that they were satisfied with present arrangements.

The main area in which co-ordinators wanted more assistance was that of visits by lecturers to the school. About 30 per cent of those who commented here called for lecturers to provide more assistance to student teachers and supervising teachers in situ; to spend more time with student teachers in the school, to visit the school more often, including occasional visits outside of practice sessions; to have more discussions with supervising teachers before and during the practice; to hold meetings or seminars for all supervising teachers; and so on.

A small number of co-ordinators (three programs) thought that student teachers needed greater practical knowledge of school curricula, or saw a need for coverage of curriculum in method courses to be better related to what was happening in schools.

A few co-ordinators indicated a desire for better co-ordination regarding the times at which block practices were held.

Earlier notification as to numbers of and names of student teachers to be accommodated at the school and more background information on individual students were requested by a co-ordinator in each of six programs.

Better preparation of students at the institution (e.g. more emphasis on teaching methods, discipline, lesson planning) was suggested by a small number of respondents drawn from several programs.

There were a few calls for lecturers to give sample lessons.

The theme of communication and interaction among lecturers, student teachers and school personnel, mentioned both in this and the preceding subsection, was taken up at the school experience seminars. At these seminars, good communication was seen to be very important to the effectiveness of the school experience program. Poor or absent communication was thought to create ambiguity and conflict. There was seen to be a need for better communication, both between the tertiary institution and the school and within the school.

11.0 DESIRABLE CHANGES TO SCHOOL EXPERIENCE TO MAKE IT A MORE MEANINGFUL PREPARATION FOR TEACHING

All four groups of respondents were given the opportunity to suggest how school experience could be changed to make it a more meaningful preparation for teaching. While answers to many of the previous questions provided respondents' views on possible changes and improvements to the school experience program, this question was aimed at giving respondents the opportunity to make comments which may not have been covered in previous questions. In some cases, answers to this question repeated or elaborated upon answers to previous questions.

11.1 Student teacher responses

More than 80 per cent of the students gave suggestions as to how school experience could be improved.

Easily the most popular response in all programs was that there should be more school experience. This response was made by about 40 per cent of all those making suggestions. A variety of proposals for increasing the time spent on school experience was put forward, the most frequent being for the longer blocks (those in programs with blocks of two to four weeks' duration wanted these extended to four, five or six weeks) to allow students more time to settle in and build relationships with the class. Proposals to include regular contact (e.g. weekly visits of a day or half a day) in addition to block practice, as a preparation for block practice, and in some cases a follow-up to it, were put forward. Several calls were also made for more blocks, e.g. one each semester (from students in a program with only one block) or in blocks at different times of the year, and for a full semester to be spent practice teaching.

A few respondents (two programs only) thought block practice should be entirely replaced by regular contact, as this would allow better integration of college and school and more gradual development of the student's teaching, and place the student under less stress.

By contrast, however, some of the students in a program which formally included regular school contact wanted this regular contact to be reduced in favour of more block practice. It was also suggested, by students in the programs with six-week blocks, that this block be divided into two three-week blocks as this would be less tiring and would allow the student to reflect on the one experience before beginning the next. This contrasts with the suggestions reported above for longer blocks.

There were a number of comments relating to supervising teachers. In the main, **students felt that (a) there should be greater scrutinisation of potential supervising teachers** so that only those who were "suitable" (e.g. keen to help student teachers learn, supportive, able to empathise with students) were chosen, and (b) **there should be some sort of in-service education or short induction course for teachers to better prepare them for their supervising role and inform them about the school experience program and its expectations.** Other responses concerning supervising teachers were that there should be more time for discussion with them, and more feedback to the student from them; and that supervising teachers should not require students to teach in the same way as they did, but allow them to use those strategies the student felt were best. While some students thought that students should be allocated to more than one teacher so as to be exposed to a greater cross-section of approaches, others wanted to work with only one teacher.

A wide variety of proposals was advanced as to how students should spend their time at the school. The most frequent were the following:

(i) more teaching without supervision, being left alone with the class for at least part of the time, particularly towards the end of the final practice in order to make the teaching experience more realistic (twenty-six respondents in nine programs);

(ii) more opportunity to observe teachers other than the supervising teacher in action and talk to them about their strategies or specific skills (sixteen respondents in nine programs);

(iii) experience in a greater variety of teaching situations and schools, e.g. small group and individual work as well as whole class work, open area as well as conventional classrooms, composite as well as single year-level classes, multicultural classes, one-teacher schools, private as well as government schools, country as well as metropolitan (fourteen respondents in seven programs);

(iv) more opportunities for teaching consecutive lessons or implementing full units, rather than isolated lessons, e.g. taking all lessons in a particular subject with a class for a three-week period (eight respondents in three secondary programs), and for continuous teaching, e.g. taking a full program for a week (eight respondents in five programs);

(v) more involvement in administrative procedures and duties, e.g. keeping of rolls, departmental records, cash books; playground duty and extra-curricular activities (twelve respondents in seven programs); and

(vi) less emphasis on writing up of observation lessons and lesson notes (six respondents in three programs).

A number of responses, from students in about eight programs, pertained to lecturers: students called for more contact with, visits from, discussion with, and feedback from lecturers.

Concerning the campus component of the program, it was suggested by a small number of students that this tie in more closely with school experience (e.g. more lectures on curriculum planning, more assistance with lesson preparation, more teaching of content) and that there be more free time for preparation prior to the practice. In addition, a few people considered there should be more liaison between school and institution, and more discussion involving both the supervising teacher and the lecturer.

Several respondents were concerned that there was too much emphasis on assessment of students during school experience, putting too much pressure on students to obtain a certain grade, and so detracting from the practice as a learning experience. It was suggested by some students that assessment be on a pass/fail basis rather than on a rating scale.

11.2 Supervising teacher responses

Replies to this question were received from about three-quarters of the supervising teacher sample. A small number of these said either that no improvement appeared necessary or that none was possible.

Over 40 per cent of those replying here recommended that students spend more time in schools. Ways indicated for increasing the amount of school experience included lengthening the block practices (the most common suggestion), increasing the number of block practices, and having regular contact with a school as well as (e.g. as a prelude to or follow-up of) block practice. In addition, a small number of teachers suggested students have a "professional semester" or a full six months of teaching practice, or be "attached" to practising teachers as "apprentices" or assistant teachers for a period.

Each of the remaining types of comments was made by far fewer respondents than was that concerning the amount of school experience.

One to four people in almost every program suggested that school experience (some respondents referred explicitly to the final year or the final practice) include more time actually teaching as opposed to, say, observing similarly, more continuous teaching, a heavier teaching load, e.g. teaching a full timetable for at least one week, or teaching without the class teacher being present were also seen to be desirable.

Comments concerning the on-campus component of the course were that the lectures should be more relevant, that there should be more practical work at the college or university, and that students should be better prepared before going to practice (e.g. know how to plan units and lessons, have covered in lectures any work they would be expected to teach at the practice school, have been taught a variety of methodologies and discipline techniques, and

know the school syllabus and be able to apply it). A few respondents called for the practice experience to be followed up back at the college.

A number of teachers mentioned college or university lecturers in their replies. In most programs, one or two teachers suggested that there should be more discussion with lecturers, more lecturer attendance at school to consult staff, more frequent visits by lecturers, and longer visits by lecturers. There were a few calls for lecturers to actually teach a class in the school, either as an example or model for the students, or to familiarise themselves with classroom problems.

The timing of school experience was the subject of some responses. Mainly, these responses noted that practices should not be undertaken during or just before school testing or examination times, but there were also calls for greater flexibility about timing so as to better suit individual schools.

More variety in the practice teaching experience was suggested, including observation of, or discussion with, a greater variety of teachers, and teaching in a greater variety of teaching situations such as composite classes, at various levels, and in a variety of schools.

There were a few calls for students to cover all areas of a teacher's work, including report preparation, interaction with parents, record keeping and extra-curricular activities.

A small number of supervising teachers indicated here a desire for better communication of the college's expectations of them and of the student teacher.

11.3 School co-ordinator responses

About 65 per cent of the co-ordinators commented here, although a few of those said the present situation was satisfactory or that they could suggest no changes.

Nearly half the co-ordinators who commented suggested increasing the amount of school experience, through longer blocks, regular contact, more frequent blocks, or in a few cases, an internship or apprenticeship of one semester's duration.

A number of co-ordinators thought school experience would be improved if students were better prepared at the teacher education institution before coming to schools to practice. They wanted students to have more knowledge of school curricula and of the content they were to teach, teaching methods, the "mechanics" of taking a lesson, skills such as use of teaching aids and of questioning, administrative tasks, and the responsibilities of teaching.

Better timing of school experience from the school's point of view (e.g. avoiding exam times) was proposed by a small number of co-ordinators (five programs).

Some co-ordinators saw better liaison with teacher education lecturers as necessary. For example, they wanted lecturers to pay more regular visits to schools, or spend more time in the schools, and clearer explanation by lecturers of the objectives of the program and the school's role in it.

The many remaining suggestions were made by only one or two people each, or were restricted to a particular program.

11.4 Lecturer responses

Comments were made by roughly 80 per cent of the lecturers, though about 10 per cent of these said they considered school experience to be adequate at present.

Nearly one-quarter of the lecturers who commented suggested that the amount of school experience be increased. As with the previous groups of respondents,

suggested ways of doing this included longer block practices; more frequent blocks; regular contact before, between or after blocks; and arrangements variously termed "apprenticeship", "internship" or "professional semester" whereby students would spend a whole semester or year in a school practising their teaching. This last type of suggestion was relatively more popular among lecturers than among the previous groups.

Quite a number of comments concerned supervising teachers; the main suggestion here (nearly one-fifth of responding lecturers) was that these teachers be more carefully selected so that students were allocated only to teachers who were "experienced", "dedicated", "caring", "committed to the supervision role", "master teachers" or "expert in modern methodology". Several lecturers called for the teacher education institution to be able to select the supervising teachers. In-service development, preparation, training, or grooming of supervising teachers regarding the supervisory role was recommended by lecturers involved in eight of the programs. Also suggested was giving teachers more time (e.g. by reducing their teaching loads) to allow them to fulfil the supervisory role.

Another proposal pertaining to the school and the supervising teachers was that there be a greater preparedness to fit in with students' needs and particular abilities, and to allow the student teacher to experiment with methodology.

Comments directly concerning the role of lecturers in school experience were also frequent. These included calls for more involvement before and during the practice (e.g. consultation, help in lesson and unit planning) by lecturers with the students they supervised during the practice; conducting of college courses, particularly in curriculum, in a school setting; a more direct relationship between academic studies and school experience; more careful selection or allocation of college lecturers to supervise students' practices, taking into account, for example, commitment to the role, or to a particular method advocated or curriculum specialisation; providing more time for lecturers to be involved with supervision, e.g. more staff, fewer students for each lecturer to supervise; and more training in the role of supervisor.

Closer liaison or more dialogue between school and college staff was suggested by one or two people in each of four programs.

A few lecturers raised again the subject of the timing of school experience. In this regard, the undesirability of having school experience in school examination periods was mentioned.

Another few wanted to see students experience a wider variety of year levels, schools or supervising teachers.

SUMMARY

The study sought the opinions of student teachers, supervising teachers, school co-ordinators of practice teaching and teacher education lecturers on a number of aspects of school experience which had been identified as important issues from the literature on school experience and from preliminary discussions with small numbers of students, lecturers and school personnel.

The results of the questionnaire phase of the study are based on responses of 443 student teachers, 433 supervising teachers, 228 co-ordinators and 190 lecturers drawn from the fourteen primary and secondary pre-service teacher education programs in Queensland in 1982. The overall response rate for the survey was 78 per cent.

A summary of the main findings is given below. While there were naturally some differences of opinion concerning the programs, many of the findings are applicable to school experience across the State, rather than applying to one or two programs in particular. Indeed, one was struck more by the similarity of the opinions concerning the fourteen programs than by differences among the programs.

Timing, duration and form of school experience

While a majority of respondents considered that the time given to block practice was "about right", a not insubstantial minority of all groups of respondents considered that insufficient time was allocated to this form of school experience. A greater proportion of respondents reported that more time should be devoted to contact with a school on a regular basis. The major advantage of regular contact was seen to be that contact prior to block practice would be a valuable preparation for the block as it would allow student teachers to develop a relationship with the school, the pupils and the supervising teacher. Regular contact over a long period was also seen as giving student teachers the opportunity to appreciate curriculum development and children's development, as allowing students to participate in a wide range of school activities, and as allowing more lecturer input into a student's school experience. On the other hand, a frequently-mentioned disadvantage of regular contact was its disjointed nature and that it prevented a continuous sequence of lessons being planned and taught by student teachers.

It is also interesting to note that the most common response to a question concerning the ways in which school experience could be made a more meaningful preparation for teaching was that the amount of school experience should be increased.

With respect to the time in the year at which block practice was held, there was little agreement on a most suitable time. Nonetheless, the responses showed that school examination times should be avoided if possible, or certainly that only a small proportion of all block practices should be held during the examination period. Some value was seen in scheduling one block practice right at the beginning of the school year.

Activities undertaken in school experience and settings in which school experience undertaken

According to the student teachers, most of their time during school experience was taken up in activities such as preparation, teaching a class and observing supervising teachers. Relatively little time was spent on activities such as meetings with parents, attending school staff meetings, observing lecturers teach lessons in the school, participating in school extra-curricular activities, working with teacher aides and interacting with specialist teachers. While the activities in the former group were seen, by students, teachers and lecturers, as more important than those in the latter group, a large proportion of students reported that more time should be devoted to the activities mentioned in the latter group.

While nearly all students had teaching experience in the upper, middle and lower areas

of the primary or secondary school and in the appropriate subject areas, smaller proportions had teaching experience in team-teaching situations, open-area classrooms, teaching composite classes or in country schools. Teaching experience in these four settings was generally seen to be of moderate importance by the student teachers.

Selection of supervising teachers

School co-ordinators mentioned three main bases on which they selected teachers to be supervisors. These were the teacher's willingness to have a student teacher, the teacher's teaching experience and the teacher's teaching ability. The teachers themselves reported becoming supervisors because they were asked to or told to, because they wanted to help student teachers or because they felt that it was part of their professional responsibility.

There was some concern expressed by student teachers, supervising teachers themselves and most notably by lecturers that some supervising teachers were unsuitable for that role. More careful screening was therefore called for, and it was suggested that criteria other than willingness to supervise be used in selecting supervising teachers.

Role of supervising teachers

Both students and teachers agreed that ideally teachers should provide more help to students in the area of long-term curriculum planning and implementation of long-term curricula. Students also wanted to have more discussions with supervising teachers.

Student teachers considered that the teacher's attitude towards the student was an important aspect of supervision. "Helpful", "supportive", "reassuring" supervisors were seen as desirable. Other aspects of the supervising teacher's role which were seen to be particularly important by students were the provision of critical feedback to students, and allowing student teachers freedom in the planning and implementation of lessons.

Many supervising teachers commented on the limited amount of time they had in which to have discussions with student teachers concerning aspects of school experience.

Role of lecturers

In student teachers' opinion, the amount of involvement of lecturers in school experience was completely inadequate. This was particularly so for the frequency with which lecturers taught demonstration lessons in the schools. Students were critical of the influence which lecturers had on students' assessments considering the small amount of time which lecturers spent observing them.

The lecturers also wanted to teach demonstration lessons in schools more frequently. However, they reported that this would be possible only if the lecturer was able to achieve a long-term working relationship with a school so that he or she would be familiar with the pupils and the teacher's program. Teaching of isolated lessons without a thorough knowledge of the pupils was not supported by the lecturers.

Many lecturers said that in order for them to be able to spend more time in school experience, there would need to be a reduction in their commitments at the tertiary institution during periods of school experience.

Relationship between tertiary studies and school experience

Student teachers perceived the least relationship between school experience and tertiary studies, lecturers perceived the greatest, while the views of supervising teachers fell between these two groups. There was, nonetheless, agreement that a more meaningful relationship was desirable. Student teachers were prepared for school experience, for example, by lecturers making reference to situations which students might encounter during practice; discussion of strategies which might be useful in schools; lecturers providing students with help in planning lessons or units of work; and the development of resources which could be used in schools. It was also reported that discussion of school experience took place in lectures after school experience. Assignments based on school experience, or set with a view to their usefulness in school experience were also used in some cases.

The main suggestions for achieving a more meaningful relationship between school experience and tertiary studies were:

- making lectures more practically-oriented and relevant to the school situation
- having more lecturer involvement in schools generally and in school experience in particular, e.g. requiring lecturers to return to teach in schools periodically
- improving the communication between schools and tertiary institutions
- having more discussion of school experience in campus lectures
- making more use of supervising teachers as guest lecturers in tertiary institutions
- incorporating regular contact with schools into the school experience program
- spending more time in college on planning of lessons to be used in school experience
- making more use of assignments based on school experience.

Communication between schools and tertiary institutions

The need for improved and more frequent communication and liaison between schools and supervising teachers on the one hand and tertiary institutions and lecturers on the other was evident in answers to a number of questions on the questionnaire.

Supervising teachers reported that they wanted more frequent consultation with college or university staff concerning expectations for school experience and in developing solutions to problems which teachers were experiencing. When asked in what areas they wanted more assistance from tertiary institutions, the most common response from supervising teachers was that they would like a clearer idea of what the tertiary institution expected of both the student teacher and the supervising teacher during school experience.

School personnel reported that they received adequate information about the overall school experience program, and that the practice teaching handbooks were a useful source of this information. However, teachers were generally dissatisfied with the amount of information which they received about individual student teachers. The teachers wanted more information about the courses which the student had completed in the tertiary institution, the student's previous school experience, the student's areas of specific expertise, and, in some cases, a student's areas of weakness.

Participation of school personnel in activities designed to plan school experience

Twenty-three per cent of supervising teachers had attended meetings or seminars for supervising teachers at the tertiary institution and 37 per cent had attended meetings or seminars at the school. Only a very small proportion of teachers had been involved in other planning activities such as advisory committees for planning school experience, committees for planning practice teaching handbooks or designing evaluation schedules for school experience. The proportion of school co-ordinators participating in school experience planning activities was somewhat higher. Nonetheless, a greater proportion of teachers and co-ordinators than actually participated in planning activities wanted to participate. The principal factor preventing more involvement of school personnel in these activities was lack of time: teachers and co-ordinators reported that they would require permission to leave the school and relief from teaching duties in order to be able to increase their participation in activities designed to plan school experiences.

Assessment of student teachers

Students in particular seemed to be unsure about who was involved in making an assessment of their school experience and how the assessment was made. They were concerned that lecturers had too much input into their assessment given the limited amount of time which they spent observing each student teacher.

Both school co-ordinators and lecturers reported that attempts were made to moderate ratings awarded to student teachers. In many cases, this was done informally in discussions between teachers, school co-ordinators and tertiary lecturers. In a few programs, it was the specific task of an experienced principal or of members of

college staff to ensure comparability of rating standards. Nonetheless, there was a substantial minority of student teachers who considered that there was variation among lecturers and between supervising teachers in the standard required for a particular rating of their school experience.

While comments were not specifically requested on the form of the rating scale which should be used, several respondents nonetheless commented on it. There was little agreement concerning whether a seven-point, four- or five-point, or pass/fail rating system should be used.

Supervising teachers and lecturers felt that the assessment criteria were discussed adequately with student teachers, but the student teachers themselves generally wanted more discussion of the criteria.

REFERENCES

Boothroyd, W. Teaching Practice Supervision - a research report. *British Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 5, no. 3, 1979, 243-250.

Campbell, W.J., Evans, G.T., Philp, H.W.S. and Levis, D.G. "A study of the pre-service and initial in-service development of primary school teachers". In M. Hewitson (ed.). *Research into Teacher Education: The Practical Teaching Skills*. Canberra: AGPS, 1979.

Conant, J.B. *The Education of American Teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Hewitson, M. *Research into Teacher Education: The Practical Teaching Skills*. Canberra: AGPS, 1979.

Marland, P.W. *Aspects of Supervision in Teaching Practice*. Townsville: James Cook University of North Queensland and Townsville College of Advanced Education, 1981.

Mount Lawley College of Advanced Education. *The Practicum: Present and Future*. Mount Lawley, W.A.: Mount Lawley CAE, 1975.

National Inquiry into Teacher Education. (Chair: J.J. Auchmuty). Canberra: AGPS, 1980.

Newman, W. and Arkins, B. *The Role of School Experience in Teacher Eduction*. Armidale: Armidale CAE, 1980.

Nineteen Seventy-Eight Review: Teacher Education in Queensland. (Chair: G.W. Bassett). Brisbane: Board of Advanced Education and Board of Teacher Education, 1978.

Price, D.A. *The Practicum in Queensland 1978*. Brisbane: Mount Gravatt College of Advanced Education, 1978.

Skilton, R.J. "Study of the policies of practice teaching of teacher education programs in Queensland in 1975/76". In M. Hewitson (ed.). *Research into Teacher Education: The Practical Teaching Skills*. Canberra: AGPS, 1979.

Teacher Education Review Committee. *The Preparation of Teachers to Teach Reading and Associated Language Skills*. Toowong: Board of Teacher Education, Queensland, 1979.

Teacher Education Review Committee. *The Induction of Beginning Primary Teachers*. Toowong: Board of Teacher Education, Queensland, 1981.

Turney, C., Cairns, L.G., Eltis, K.J., Hatton, N., Thew, D.M., Towler, J. and Wright, R. *The Practicum in Teacher Education*. Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1982.

Zeichner, K.M. Myths and realities: field-based experiences in pre-service teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 31, no. 6, 1980, 45-55.

PART 2

Report of

School Experience Seminars

REPORT OF SCHOOL EXPERIENCE SEMINARS

During the period October-December 1983, seminars were held at the various teacher education institutions in Queensland to discuss the survey results of the Board's project on school experience. Supervising teachers, school co-ordinators of teaching practice, student teachers, first-year teachers, college or university teacher education lecturers and, in some cases, inspectors of schools participated in the seminars. Over the State as a whole, more than 400 people were involved.

The seminars varied in format, but a component of most of the seminars was small group discussion during which seminar participants discussed questions prepared prior to the seminar.

A large number of suggestions and recommendations emerged from the seminars. These were of two types: those specific to the particular program being discussed, and those of a more general nature with implications for school experience across the State. A summary of the major issues raised in the seminars, with emphasis on the latter type of recommendation, is given below. The points raised below are recurrent themes which occurred during the seminars, and do not necessarily reflect a consensus of views.

Timing and duration of school experience

School experience was regarded as occupying a central place in programs of pre-service teacher education. Many participants in the seminars considered that the time devoted to school experience in courses of pre-service teacher preparation should be increased. This was coupled with the recognition that staffing and funding constraints made it difficult to increase the total amount of time allocated to school experience. There were nonetheless some suggestions for re-organising the time and for increasing the total time by having student teachers engage in informal contact with schools.

It was suggested that the time could be re-organised so that the amount of time in final-year school experience was increased, while the time allocated in earlier years might be decreased.

The possibility of introducing a professional semester or an extended block of teaching in a student's final year was raised. This would allow students to have a longer and more continuous period of contact with a school than occurred with shorter blocks, and would provide student teachers with the opportunity to experience school routines and a range of teaching situations.

It was thought that there should not be a long break between the final block practice and the conclusion of the pre-service teacher education course. A block practice should be held at least in second semester of the final year, although August was still considered too early for the conclusion of the final block practice.

It was considered important that school experience be held at various times of the year so that students could experience the differing demands on schools and teachers throughout the year. For instance, a practice at the beginning of the school year would allow students to experience the school routines and teaching tasks which were necessary then, while a practice near the end of a semester would provide student teachers with an opportunity to gain experience of a school at examination time.

Merit was seen in students having regular contact with a school prior to their block practice. On these preliminary visits the students might provide assistance to the supervising teacher similar to that provided by a teacher aide. The pre-practice visits would give students the opportunity to become familiar with their class, the school and the teacher's program, and allow expectations for school experience to be discussed. In order for these pre-practice visits to be possible, an early allocation of students to supervising teachers would need to be made.

In some programs, a day or a half-day each week was timetabled free of campus lectures. Students could use this free time for informal contact with schools, as

described above. Lecturers, teachers and principals could provide more encouragement to student teachers to forge links with schools outside formal block practice periods.

Value was also seen in regular weekly contact with the class after the block practice.

Variety of activities undertaken in school experience

There was general agreement that student teachers should experience a greater variety of activities during school experience. These included:

- interacting with parents
- working with teacher aides
- involvement in school extra-curricular activities
- interaction with specialist teachers
- attending school staff meetings.

Schools might consider giving students the opportunity to interact with parents by inviting student teachers to P. & C. evenings, allowing them to sit in on parent-teacher interviews, and encouraging students to work with parent teacher aides. The school co-ordinator of teaching practice should also point out to students the extra-curricular activities which were offered and encourage students to take an interest in these activities. It was considered that the participation of student teachers in such activities was a matter for individual schools and should not be prescribed by colleges or universities.

Settings in which school experience undertaken

Seminar participants were of the opinion that student teachers should be exposed to a variety of settings during their practice teaching. It was seen as desirable that students had experience in open-area classrooms, in team-teaching situations, at all primary or secondary year levels as appropriate to the level of the course, in country schools, and in schools with students from different socio-economic levels. Although it was not always possible to provide student teachers with experience in all of these settings, tertiary institutions and schools needed to be aware of the desirability of giving students a diversity of settings in which to teach.

It was remarked that the provision of a range of settings for student teachers would be facilitated if formal records of students' teaching practice were maintained and forwarded to their practising schools so that the students might be allocated to classes on the basis of situations in which they had yet to teach.

Teaching practice in country schools was considered desirable because of the probability of students being appointed to country schools during their first year of teaching. A possible disadvantage of country teaching practice was the difficulty college lecturers would experience in visiting the school and observing students.

It was suggested that student teachers should be given the opportunity to observe a variety of teaching styles during their school experience.

The idea of students working in non-school settings such as community organisations was raised.

Role of lecturers in school experience

It was seen as important that lecturers involved in school experience be committed to it. Supervising teachers and student teachers valued the interest shown by lecturers in school experience and in schools generally. Lecturers who were committed to the school experience program and who were highly visible in schools helped to engender enthusiasm amongst school personnel.

However, lecturers' commitments on campus limited the amount of time they could spend in schools. It was suggested that tertiary institutions might consider reducing lecturers' campus commitments during school experience by, for example, not scheduling committee meetings when students were in the schools.

It was suggested that the policy of some tertiary institutions, particularly the universities, also had the effect of limiting involvement of staff in school experience. For example, it was sometimes policy that no allowance was made to a lecturer's load for the time spent in supervision of school experience, school experience commitments were not taken into consideration when the departmental staff entitlements were being established and research rather than participation in school experience was more important for promotion purposes.

It was suggested that not all lecturers were suitable as supervisors. The selection and preparation of lecturers for their role in school experience might therefore need to be examined by tertiary institutions.

Many seminar participants considered that the role of teacher education lecturers involved in school experience should be mainly one of helping students to plan lessons, of discussing lessons with the student and supervising teacher, and of liaising between schools and the tertiary institution.

Students were often critical of lecturers because they considered that lecturers had an influence on their assessment out of proportion to the amount of time which the lecturers spent observing each student teacher. It was considered, however, that the lecturers' main role in assessment should be one of negotiating grades and clarifying the criteria used in assessment. Their role in assessment should be clearly explained to student teachers.

The teaching of isolated demonstration lessons in the school by lecturers was not supported. Seminar participants felt it would be unfair to expect lecturers with little knowledge of the class or of the teacher's overall program to walk in "off the street" and teach a lesson to the class. However, value was seen in lecturers forming a long-term working relationship with one school or a small number of schools. They would then become acquainted with the pupils and the teachers and would have more confidence in teaching lessons or units of work.

At some tertiary institutions, there was a differentiation of responsibilities between "liaison lecturers" and "curriculum studies lecturers". Liaison lecturers were required to visit students before the practice or very early in it to ensure that the students had received all relevant information, to provide continuing contact between schools, students and the tertiary institution, to observe students teaching and advise those in need of help, and to ensure that students received assistance if needed. It was generally considered that the liaison lecturer was critical in solving or helping to solve problems and the role of liaison lecturer was strongly supported in those institutions which had this or similar positions. Liaison lecturers were well placed to build up strong and continuing links with particular schools.

In some tertiary institutions, because of the way lecturers were allocated to supervise student teachers, the students did not know their supervising lecturer before the practicum. This was considered highly undesirable. It was recommended that lecturers and the students they were to supervise should meet before school experience.

A suggestion was made that some lecturers should be school-based. These lecturers would spend all of their time working in the schools and would have no lecturing commitments at the tertiary institution.

Selection and preparation of supervising teachers

The careful selection of teachers to supervise students during school experience was seen as crucial to the success of the school experience program. It was thought that a prime consideration in the selection of supervising teachers should be their willingness to undertake supervisory duties: teachers should not be coerced into taking students. The school principal or co-ordinator had a key role in selecting supervising teachers. It was important, then, that the criteria for effective supervision should be identified and that those selecting supervising teachers were aware of these criteria.

There was some suggestion that it was becoming more difficult to attract teachers to supervision. The problem was exacerbated by recent increases in numbers of pre-service teacher education students. Ways needed to be found, therefore, of encouraging more teachers to undertake supervision, and of maintaining the interest and enthusiasm of those teachers who were presently supervising student teachers.

Some recognition should, it was felt, be given to the status of supervising teachers. While payment was one form of recognition, it was thought that other incentives could be examined. These included providing supervising teachers with some relief from their teaching duties, having "supervising teacher" as a career step which would earn extra remuneration, and providing supervising teachers with credit towards an education degree. A suggestion was made that a unit on supervision could be included in the Bachelor of Education program. Tertiary institutions might consider giving official recognition to supervising teachers by appointing them as "teacher education associates" or "temporary lecturers" or by accrediting supervising teachers or establishing a register of teachers suitable to be supervisors. More use could also be made of supervising teachers as guest lecturers at tertiary institutions.

It was thought, too, that staff of the tertiary institution could play a significant part in helping to engender a sense of commitment amongst teachers to the school experience program. Lecturers who were enthusiastic themselves and who were prepared to spend time in the schools talking to teachers or in helping to organise seminars for current or prospective supervising teachers tended to engender a similar enthusiasm in teachers.

School inspectors could also do much to encourage greater involvement of schools and increased participation of teachers in school experience programs. For instance, inspectors could emphasise the role of the school as a practising school in the inspectorial report. Similarly, inspectors could stress the contribution of a teacher as a supervising teacher when compiling an appraisement of the teacher for promotional purposes.

A suggestion which would help considerably to ease the shortage or potential shortage of supervising teachers was the idea of placing two student teachers under the supervision of one teacher. This would have the additional benefit of allowing opportunities for student teachers to observe each other's teaching and to provide each other with evaluative feedback.

It was seen as necessary to ensure that supervising teachers were adequately prepared for their supervisory tasks. Seminars at the tertiary institution were one form of in-service preparation for this. However, due to time constraints and other pressures on teachers, these seminars were not always well attended. Moreover, it was often only the committed teachers who participated. Seminars in schools were therefore seen as a more attractive alternative. Supervising teachers would not necessarily need to be involved in seminars every year, but teachers who would be supervising students in the particular program for the first time should be involved. Supervising teachers were more likely to be attracted to seminars if the lecturers involved in them were committed to the school experience program and if the teachers felt that they were able to gain some ideas which they could use in their own teaching. A suggestion was made that teachers should be involved in the planning and organisation of seminars to prepare them for their supervisory role.

It was felt that some form of evaluation of supervising teachers could be undertaken. This might take the form, for instance, of students reporting on which supervising teachers had been helpful in particular areas so that students needing assistance in similar areas could be assigned to these teachers. Students, school co-ordinators and lecturers could also pass on comments to the supervising teachers about the quality of their supervision.

Participation of teachers in planning activities

The survey results indicated that the proportion of teachers involved in activities designed to plan and co-ordinate school experience was low and that a large number of supervising teachers who wanted to be involved were not presently participating in the planning activities. Tertiary institutions might consider ways of using the untapped resource of teachers who were willing to help plan school experience, assist in the development of practice teaching handbooks, and so on.

One idea raised for increasing the participation of teachers was to have a school experience committee in each school. The committee would advise the principal on practice teaching policy for the school.

Another proposal being considered by one college was that, for each of twenty-five

secondary subjects, six teachers involved in teaching a particular subject would plan a practice teaching handbook for the subject. This would mean 150 teachers were involved.

It was also considered that teacher representatives on school experience committees should ensure that they provided adequate feedback to supervising teachers concerning the committee's considerations, and that they sought teachers' opinions on school experience.

The possibility of circulating minutes of school experience committee meetings to supervising teachers was also raised.

Provision of information to supervising teachers about individual student teachers

Supervising teachers often had little information about students whom they were supervising. It was considered that some information would be useful to supervising teachers to help them to provide better guidance to students. It was suggested therefore that student teachers should forward a completed pro-forma to their supervising teacher listing their strengths, areas of special interest and college courses undertaken, and a summary of their practice teaching experiences so far. There was also a suggestion that the student provide the teacher with information on "weaknesses" or areas needing special attention. However, some participants in the seminars felt that information on weaknesses should not be given as this could lead to teacher prejudice when the student was being assessed.

Information provided to teachers would need to be sent to teachers at least a few days before the practice.

Communication and interaction

Good communication among lecturers, supervising teachers, school co-ordinators and student teachers was seen to be very important to the effectiveness of the school experience program. Poor or absent communication was thought to create ambiguity and conflict. There was seen to be a need for better communication, both between the tertiary institution and the school and within the school.

A suggestion was that more meetings of supervising teachers and lecturers be held before school experience to ensure that all were aware of the aims and objectives of school experience and that expectations of all participants were clarified. These meetings could be of two types: group meetings, attended by a large number of lecturers and supervising teachers from different schools; and meetings in the school involving a small number of supervising teachers, the lecturer who was working with them, and possibly the student teachers involved. At least one meeting of the lecturer, supervising teacher and student teacher after school during the practicum would also be valuable.

There was also seen to be a need for effective communication between supervising teachers and their representatives on school experience committees. Teachers on school experience committees should provide supervising teachers with information about the deliberations of school experience committees, and should seek the opinions of supervising teachers about school experience so that these might be represented at the committee meeting. One suggestion for keeping teachers informed about the results of school experience committee meetings was to circulate the minutes of the meetings to all supervising teachers, or to have a yearly supervisors' newsletter, written by supervising teachers on the school experience committee and circulated to supervising teachers associated with a particular program. Personal contact, however, was seen as preferable because teachers tended not to read all written material sent to them.

A proposal was put forward that a feedback sheet for supervising teachers be attached to the assessment form teachers completed on students' practice teaching. Teachers could write on the feedback form their comments on the program, notes about new approaches they had tried during the practice which might be of interest to other supervising teachers or the school experience committee, and so forth.

School co-ordinators of teaching practice also needed to be provided with opportunities for sharing their ideas on school experience amongst themselves. A seminar of school co-ordinators, at which they could discuss their innovative ideas, might be arranged.

Relationship between school experience and tertiary studies

It was felt to be essential that a strong relationship exist between school experience and tertiary studies. In order to achieve this, staff of tertiary institutions needed to be conversant with school processes and supervising teachers needed to be familiar with the tertiary course and the aims of school experience.

Lecturers involved in school experience might consider returning to teach in schools from time to time. This might be done on an exchange basis with a teacher, who would lecture in the college during the period the staff member of the tertiary institution was teaching in the school. Encouragement could be given to lecturers to teach during their professional leave.

More use should be made of teachers as guest lecturers or as seconded staff members in the tertiary institutions. School co-ordinators and supervising teachers could also be invited to observe students' lectures in order to gain an appreciation of the content and processes involved in a student's campus work.

Meetings or conferences of supervising teachers and lecturers before school experience would help to ensure a closer relationship.

An integrated relationship between school experience and campus studies would be fostered if assignments were based on students' work during school experience.

More use could be made of curriculum units which students designed in the college by having them implemented by students in the schools.

Assessment of student teachers' school experience

Students often did not have a sound appreciation of the methods used in their assessment, particularly the role played by the lecturer. The processes used in assessment, the role of the various personnel involved and the criteria used in assessment therefore needed to be clearly explained to student teachers.

A grading system, rather than a "pass/fail" dichotomy, was supported by a majority of participants in the seminars. A grading system was favoured because it helped to motivate students, rewarded those students who were performing at a high level, and provided valuable information for employing authorities when selecting teachers for employment. It was considered important that a moderation system be used to help ensure comparability of grades among student teachers. One system of moderation which was considered to be successful involved an experienced principal observing all final-year students and moderating the grades awarded to students. This was used in a relatively small program and the principal was able to visit all students as they were in close geographical proximity.

On the other hand, some participants in the seminars and a majority at one seminar considered that the wide range of variables among schools and the diverse expectations held by different supervisors made it impossible to achieve comparability. A "pass/fail" system, with detailed written comments, was therefore advocated.

Diagnostic feedback

Diagnostic feedback to student teachers was considered essential in helping them to improve their teaching skills. Supervising teachers needed to continually communicate their opinions and expectations of the student teachers to them. However, it was felt that provision of diagnostic feedback to students was not as effective as it should be and that there was sometimes too long a delay between a student's lesson and the provision of evaluative comment on it.

In order to emphasise the significance of formative feedback, it was suggested that a period of the practicum timetable each week be allocated to it.

Lesson analysis sheets which were written by the supervising teacher and given to the student at the completion of particular lessons were regarded as being a useful way to provide students with feedback on their performance.

Lecturers also should have a role in providing diagnostic feedback to student teachers.

It was thought that more use could be made of peer evaluation of students' teaching. Allocating two student teachers to one supervising teacher would provide opportunities for peer evaluation.

APPENDIX

Membership of Research Committee, Board of Teacher Education

Mr W.L. Hamilton,
Deputy Director-General of Education, Queensland (Chairman until February 1984)

Dr W.C. Hall,
Principal, Mount Gravatt Campus, Brisbane College of Advanced Education (Chairman from March 1984)

Mr M.T.A. Byrne,
Research Officer, Department of Education, Queensland

Professor W.J. Campbell,
Professor of Education, Department of Education, University of Queensland

Mr N.H. Fry,
Executive Officer, Board of Teacher Education

Mr K.E. Imison,
Dean, School of Education, Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education (until February 1983)

Mr A.R. Johnson,
Principal, Rangeville State School, Toowoomba

Rev. Sister Patricia Nolan,
Principal, McAuley College

Dr D.A. Price,
Senior Lecturer in Education and Campus Co-ordinator of Practice Teaching, Mount Gravatt Campus, Brisbane College of Advanced Education

Mrs M. Rosser,
Teacher, Kallangur State School (from March 1984)

Mr A. Searle,
Principal, State School, Corinda (until March 1983)

Mr N.W. Sellars,
Senior Lecturer in Education, School of Education, James Cook University of North Queensland

Mr T.A. Walpole,
Teacher, Lourdes Hill College, Hawthorne (until December 1982)

Mr M.E. Weier,
Teacher, State School, Boondall (until December 1983)

Research Staff

Mrs M.M. Bella,
Assistant Secretary (Registration Policy and Assessment) (until June 1983)

Ms D.K. Cunningham,
Graduate Assistant

Mr G.J. Duck,
Research Officer